# QUARTERLY JOURNAL of SPEECH

Speech Association of America

APRIL · 1958
Volume XLIV · Number 2

# *The* QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

1915 — 1958

Published by
SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

*Editor*

Donald C. Bryant
Washington University
St. Louis 5, Missouri

*Associate Editors*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Carroll C. Arnold | BRITISH PUBLIC ADDRESS | Cornell University |
| Wallace A. Bacon | INTERPRETATION | Northwestern University |
| Earnest S. Brandenburg | ADULT EDUCATION | Washington University |
| Robert D. Clark | HOMILETICS AND PREACHING | University of Oregon |
| Carl A. Dallinger | COMMUNICATIONS SKILLS | State University of Iowa |
| Douglas Ehninger | PUBLIC SPEAKING AND FORENSICS | University of Florida |
| Leland M. Griffin | AMERICAN PUBLIC ADDRESS | Northwestern University |
| Robert G. Gunderson | NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW | Oberlin College |
| Warren Guthrie | TV AND RADIO | Western Reserve University |
| Marie K. Hochmuth | RHETORIC AND CRITICISM | University of Illinois |
| John V. Irwin | SPEECH AND HEARING | University of Wisconsin |
| Magdalene Kramer | TEACHING OF SPEECH | Teachers College, Columbia University |
| Richard Murphy | SHOP TALK | University of Illinois |
| David Potter | BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL SPEAKING | Michigan State University |
| Claude L. Shaver | DRAMA AND THEATRE | Louisiana State University |
| C. K. Thomas | PHONETICS | Cornell University |
| William E. Utterback | DISCUSSION | Ohio State University |

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH is published in the months of February, April, October, and December. Contributions prepared in accordance with THE MLA STYLE SHEET may be sent to the Editor or to the appropriate Associate Editor. Subscriptions and requests for advertising rates should be addressed to Owen Peterson, Executive Secretary, Speech Association of America, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge 3, Louisiana.

Entered as second-class matter at the postoffice at Columbia, Missouri, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Regular subscription price $5.50 per year. Special subscriptions for undergraduate students $4.50 per year. Single copy of current issue $1.50. A comprehensive Index of the issues of the year is bound in each December JOURNAL. The contents are also indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX. For volumes prior to 1929 consult the READERS GUIDE TO PERIODICAL LITERATURE. For complete, analytical coverage through 1954, see INDEX TO THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, VOLUMES I-XL, 1915-1954, compiled by Giles W. Gray (1956). Volumes I-III were published under the title THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PUBLIC SPEAKING; Volumes IV-XIII, THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION.

Copyright 1958 by the SPEECH ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

# *The* QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOL. XLIV · APRIL 1958 · NO. 2


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| The Speech as Literary Genre | *Richard Murphy* | 117 |
| The Debate About Debating | *Douglas Ehninger* | 128 |
| Richard Sibbes's Theory and Practice of Persuasion | *Roy F. Hudson* | 137 |
| The Influence of Style of Moderation on the Outcomes of Discussion | *William E. Utterback* | 149 |
| Winston Churchill: Orator-Historian | *Charles W. Lomas* | 153 |
| John Morley: Critic of Public Address | *Dwain E. Moore* | 161 |
| Notes Toward a Theory of Diction | *Anthony Ostroff* | 166 |
| The Forum | | 175 |
| Linguistics and Literary Analysis | *John C. McLaughlin* | 175 |
| Haiman to Hellman | *Franklyn S. Haiman* | 178 |
| An Exemplary Taft Letter | *Pat M. Ryan, Jr.* | 178 |
| An Author Objects | *Leo Lowenthal* | 179 |
| The Reviewer Explains | *William G. McCollom* | 180 |
| New Books in Review | *Robert G. Gunderson* | 182 |
| Biography and Rhetorical Criticism | *Robert D. Clark* | 182 |
| The Life of Sir John Eliot | *Goodwin F. Berquist* | 186 |
| George Birkbeck, Pioneer of Adult Education *and* The Mechanics' Institutes of Lancashire and Yorkshire Before 1851 | *Waldo W. Braden* | 187 |
| Melville as Lecturer | *Ernest J. Wrage* | 188 |
| The Log-Cabin Campaign | *Richard N. Current* | 188 |
| Bourbon Leader: Grover Cleveland and the Democratic Party | *Charles W. Lomas* | 189 |
| The Cultural Life of the American Colonies, 1607-1763 | *Leland M. Griffin* | 190 |
| America's First Hamlet | *Pat M. Ryan, Jr.* | 191 |
| Critical Moments: Kenneth Burke's Categories and Critiques | *Marie Hochmuth* | 191 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sound and Poetry | *Garff B. Wilson* | 192 |
| Scandal and Parade: The Theatre of Jean Cocteau | *Robert J. Dierlam* | 193 |
| Man in His Theatre | *John E. Dietrich* | 193 |
| Novels Into Film *and* Film As Art | *Gordon L. Gray* | 194 |
| The Order of Presentation in Persuasion | *Harold F. Harding* | 194 |
| Tarheel Talk | *C. K. Thomas* | 196 |
| Verbal Behavior | *Giles Wilkeson Gray* | 196 |
| Language: An Enquiry Into Its Meaning and Function | *William Kay Archer* | 197 |
| A History of the English Language | *Lee S. Hultzén* | 198 |
| Applied Phonetics | *Bert Emsley* | 198 |
| A Dictionary of American-English Usage | *C. K. Thomas* | 199 |
| The Voice and Its Disorders | *Virgil A. Anderson* | 200 |
| Educational Guidance and the Deaf Child | *John W. Black* | 200 |
| Are You Listening? | *Hayden K. Carruth* | 201 |
| Briefly Noted | | 201 |
| Books Received | | 204 |
| The Regional Journals | *Barnet Baskerville* | 206 |
| Shop Talk | *Richard Murphy* | 212 |

*The* QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLIV APRIL 1958 NUMBER 2

# THE SPEECH AS LITERARY GENRE

Richard Murphy

AMONG the marvels of a marvelous age is the extension of studies under the generic word *Speech*. Into dramatics and dramaturgy, phonetics and phonemics, pathology and audiology, and a dozen other realms, our subject now extends. Curiously enough, that aspect of our work which for centuries justified speech as a humane subject, speech as a literary form, receives less and less attention, and seems on its way to extinction. A review of what is happening would seem to be in order. To this end the speech as a literary form is here redefined, some difficulties which prevent appreciation of the form are discussed, and a mild plea is made for a return to the appreciation of speech as a literary genre.

I.

What is literature? Let us draw on Lord Morley, as *Webster's* has done. It was in a speech made in London in 1887 that he said:

> What is literature? Literature consists of all the books—and they are not so many—where moral truth and human passion are touched with a certain largeness, sanity, and attraction of form. . . . Poets, dramatists, humourists, satirists, masters of fiction, the great preachers, the character writers, the maxim writers, the great political orators, they are all literature in so far as they teach us to know man and know human nature. This is what makes literature, rightly sifted and selected and rightly studied.[1]

In short, literature is humane speech which has enduring values, nobility of purpose, weight of idea, and beauty of form.

Since what we regard as literature has been written down—put into *litera*, letters of the alphabet—there has grown the association that literature is writing. This association is sheer accident. A ballad is no less literary because it may have been preserved for centuries in oral tradition, and never put on paper until a collector printed it. The essay is no more, no less literature because it may be written on paper. The paper is simply the instrument of communication. Imagine that before papyrus and stencil, before paper and print, came the talkies and television. Works of enduring value then would have been preserved as *teleture*, or *glottoture* —products of the tongue from afar. Homer would be *ture* because he had

*Mr. Murphy (Ph.D., Pittsburgh, 1938), is Professor of Speech, University of Illinois. He began his contributions to* QJS *in 1933 and is now serving as editor of Shop Talk. This essay is an adaptation of a speech made at the SAA convention in Chicago, December 27, 1956.*

[1] John Morley, "Address at the Mansion House," *Pall Mall Gazette*, February 28, 1887, p. 11.

been recorded on film and tape. The first oration on Cataline would be *ture* because it was spoken and filmed. The method of recording works of permanent value, that they may be preserved, is not a criterion of their merit. Whether preserved in oral tradition, parchment, print, sound and picture, or braille, it is the nature of the work preserved that determines its value.

A definition of literature is a rather simple matter. To define a speech is more involved. What is a speech, *sui generis*, as a literary genre? The presumption would be that anyone working in Speech would be able to define a speech. But if you inquire among your colleagues you may find there is no very clear definition. You may be told it is something spoken. But is a man reading from *The World Almanac* making a speech? One colleague, challenged on the matter, triumphantly recited, "You call anything speech which is a direct means of getting a thought or a feeling from one person to another with the sounds of the voice or the muscles of the body, or both."[2] This was how his textbook defined the speech, he recalled. Another confidently declared the speech to be "communication." When it was called to his attention that a Western Union telegram also is communication, he had nothing further to say on the matter. But what is *a* speech? Some confusion comes from failure to distinguish between making speech and making *a* speech. A man mumbling incoherently is making speech, speech sounds, that is, but he is not necessarily working in an art form. Turn to the contemporary textbooks to find the answer. You will not be completely illumined. Definitions by negation abound: a speech is not a report, it is not a recitation, it is not an exhibition. Through the definitions there persists the declaration that a speech is not an essay. Since the essay is, if possible, a looser and more illy defined form than even the speech, this negative definition is not completely satisfactory. What is a speech? It is not an essay. But what is an essay, which a speech is not?

The essay that the speech is not, according to contemporary speech books, has two possible meanings. One is that an essay, in Dr. Johnson's definition, is "a loose sally of the mind, an irregular, undigested piece, not a regular and orderly performance." The speech textbook writers do not want loose sallies of the mind. But to identify Bacon's essays as loose sallies of the mind is about as satisfactory as defining patriotism as the last refuge of a scoundrel. And to say there are no loose sallies in speechmaking is to strain the truth. A second meaning used in exhorting speech students is that an essay is written whereas a speech is spoken. Under this distinction, Milton's *Areopagitica*, called by him a speech, written as a speech, and studied as a speech, becomes an essay because it never was spoken. And William Hazlitt's "On the Periodical Essayists," long studied as an essay, becomes a speech because it was delivered as a lecture.

One of the most imagistic of the distinctions of speech as not essay was made by Winans and Hudson: "A speech is not merely an essay standing on its hind legs."[3] An earlier statement by Winans is more helpful in arriving

[2] Citation of this quotation, and of some other contemporary samples of counsel, is deliberately omitted. The quotations are from representative and worthy works, and have been selected as the best of their kind, without any personal intent.

[3] James Albert Winans and Hoyt Hopewell Hudson, *A First Course in Public Speaking* (New York, 1931), p. 17.

at a working definition of a speech. Back in the twenties, when there was a vogue for "oral composition," little pieces written down and then recited, he inveighed against the practice. "A speech," said Winans, "is something other than a composition done with the mouth. Speeches may be read," he continued, "spoken from memory, or extemporized; even essays and papers may be read. But," he asked, "where in the world is there a place for a thing neither speech nor essay, but a composition standing on its hind legs?"[4] In short, mere vocalization does not make a composition a speech; an essay may be vocalized, but it still is an essay for all that.

What then is an essay, even if vocalized? Let us draw on Alexander Smith, nineteenth-century essayist whose definition is widely circulated. An essay, says he, "is neither a dissertation nor a thesis. Properly speaking, it is a work of art, and must conform to artistic rules."[5] "The essay as a literary form, resembles the lyric, in so far as it is moulded by some central mood—whimsical, serious or satirical. Give the mood," thought Smith, "and the essay, from the first sentence to the last, grows around it as the cocoon grows around the silkworm. The essay-writer is a chartered libertine, and a law unto himself."[6] The essay, then, is prose composition in which the subject matter, the occasion, the raison d'etre spring from the mind and mood of the author. The discipline of the form comes from the mental habits of the composer.

At long last, what is a speech? The essential elements seem to persist through the ages. We know that Aristotle's *Rhetoric* was fashioned on speaker, speech, and audience. Quintilian carried on the tradition with his circumstances, "who it is that is speaking, before whom he is speaking, and what he says."[7] Daniel Webster's declaration that true eloquence "must exist in the man, in the subject and in the occasion"[8] is preserved even as the union. The concerns of the speaker were succinctly put by St. Ambrose in the fourth century: "quid dicat, aut cui dicat, quo in loco et tempore"[9]—what he says or to whom he says it, in what place, and under what circumstances. The mood of the writer is to the essay what the mood of the audience is to the speech.

A speech as a literary form, then, is a prose composition of varying length, fashioned for a specific or generic audience, usually but not necessarily spoken and listened to, written or recorded in some way on brain, paper, or tape for permanence, in which are inter-related author, reading or listening audience, theme, and occasion; it has ethical appeal and universality, moving force and fluency; its design is artistic, and its purpose is to direct the reader or listener to a conclusion selected by the composer.

(1) *A speech is a prose composition*, although passages may be poetic, as in Burke or Ingersoll. Systematic rhythm patterns do not occur in the literature of speeches, except as parts of a poetic whole, as in Shakespeare. When Dionysius of Miletus chanted his speech, his teacher, Isaeus, rebuked him with,

[4] James A. Winans, "Aims and Standards in Public Speaking Work," *The English Journal*, XII (1923), 230-231.

[5] Alexander Smith, "Essayists, Old and New," *Last Leaves* (Edinburgh, 1868), p. 248.

[6] Alexander Smith, "On the Writing of Essays," *Dreamthorp* (London, 1863), p. 25.

[7] Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, III, 8, 9.

[8] Daniel Webster, *A Discourse in Commemoration of the Lives and Services of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson, Delivered in Faneuil Hall, Boston, August 2, 1826* (Boston, 1826), p. 35.

[9] St. Ambrose, *De Officiis Ministrorum*, I, 10, 35.

"Young man from Iona, I did not train you to sing."[10] And the imagery in a speech differs, as Longinus observed, from that in poetry. In a speech that imagery is best which not only has energy and reality, but is "mingled with the practical, the argumentative."[11] A typical poetic image is "Ruth among the alien corn"; it is self-sufficient. Daniel Webster's figure of the mariner storm-tossed at sea[12] is a typical speech image; it directs attention to his purpose, the immediate reading of the resolution; the image is subordinated to an end.

(2) *Varying length.* Edward VIII eloquently abdicated, assisted by some stylistic touches by Winston Churchill, in a page broadcast to the world. Burke could fill a small book with his discourse. Senators have been known to talk around the clock, not always, of course, in Attic style.

(3) *Specific or generic audience.* Russell Conwell's *Acres of Diamonds* was designed for and delivered to thousands of audiences. The President frequently talks to no one assembled group, but to scattered millions around the world. This practice, admittedly, is contrary to much current theory. The textbook says: "There is no such thing as a speech in and for itself. There is only a speech on a specific subject, for a specific purpose, delivered by a specific person, before a specific audience, at a specific time and place."

(4) *Ususally, but not necessarily, spoken and listened to.* The natural destiny of a speech is to be delivered, of course. Delivery imparts an actuality, an authenticity to a speech. But it does not determine the speech; form must do that. Isocrates' *Areopagiticus* was not delivered, was not intended to be delivered, but it has served as a model speech for 2300 years. In the work-a-day world of speeches, frequently a speech text never gets delivered. Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, when under consideration for censure by the Senate, released a speech which was front-paged across the country. He was so busy he did not actually speak it, but had it "inserted in the RECORD."[13] Whatever merits the speech may have, whether it is a speech at all, will have to be determined by something other than a study of the Senator's voice and gesture. The Earl of Buchan labored well and long on a speech for a meeting of the Scottish Peers. The meeting never occurred. Undaunted, Buchan had the speech handsomely printed, and dedicated it to his brother, Thomas Erskine.[14]

(5) *Written or recorded in some way.* Unless there is some recording there can be no permanence; the speech cannot become literature. Some of the great speeches have been recorded in memory, and recollected in tranquility; William Wirt recalled what Patrick Henry said, and Dr. Johnson reconstructed Chatham.

(6) *In which are inter-related author, reading or listening audience, theme, and occasion.* Always the speech grows out of some social occasion. One does not give a speech when he is impressed by the sun, moon, or stars. He writes a lyric or a sonnet, or a personal essay.

(7) *Having ethical appeal and universality.* There is no great speech on the values of holding fellow humans as slaves; there are a great number on

[10] Philostratus, *The Lives of the Sophists*, 518.
[11] *Longinus on the Sublime*, XV, 9.
[12] Reply to Hayne.
[13] *Congressional Record*, 83d Cong., 2nd sess., November 10, 1954, pp. 14820-14823.
[14] *Speech of the Earl of Buchan, Intended to Have Been Delivered at the Meeting of the Peers of Scotland, For the General Election of Their Representatives, October 17, 1780* (Edinburgh, 1780).

the rights of free men. To be literature, the speech must transcend the immediate occasion, and have a certain timelessness. Lincoln dedicated Gettysburg, it is true, but he did it in timeless values of democratic belief. To design a speech which will have universal appeal, and yet meet the demands of a social setting, is a colossal job. All those little local flourishes—who is on the platform, acknowledgments to the committee on arrangements—so dear to a specific audience have to be cast aside if the speech is to be recorded as literature. Lincoln managed it, but it is quite a feat to appeal to the day and to the ages in one effort.

(8) *Moving force and fluency.* The speech is a dynamic form. It must have direction. It must approach, establish, and conclude. There must be a flow, a stream of rhetoric to convey the ideas past obstructions of misunderstanding, ignorance, and lethargy. The historical term for this is eloquence. A poem, a letter, an essay may be eloquent, also, but not necessarily so. Unless the speech is eloquent, it is not literature.

(9) *Artistic design.* Although there is no absolute form prescribed for a speech, such as in the sonnet, there is rather general agreement that in a speech the author starts with an audience where it is and tries to end where he thinks it ought to be. Aristotle allowed for no more than an introduction, statement, argument (including refutation), and epilogue.[15] What is now known as the classical plan is more elaborate: exordium, narration, statement, partition, proof, refutation, peroration. Textbooks have various designs for speeches, but they are all alike in that they provide for taking an audience along to a conclusion. And they are forms for speeches in that they are not fitting for a short story, novel, or ode.

(10) *Purpose.* "All the ends of speaking are reducible to four," wrote Campbell, "every speech being intended to enlighten the understanding, to please the imagination, to move the passions, or to influence the will."[16] Campbell's psychology has been somewhat modernized, but his definition still remains as the classic, although it may be translated into such terms as "to inform, to impress, to entertain, to persuade," or "to interest, to make clear, to induce belief, to influence conduct." Some of these purposes may be achieved, of course, in other literary forms. The distinctive element in speeches is that one, some, or all of these are attained in relation to an audience. In the lyric or the letter, the purpose may be no more than to express oneself.

2.

If the speech as a literary form is to achieve its full maturity, several misconceptions will have to be cleared away. One of these is the illusion of spontaneity. In popular view, "rising to the occasion" is glorified above all else. Conscientious speakers still rehearse their line, "Had I but known that I was to be called upon to say a few words." Speakers try to conceal scraps of paper in the palm of the hand to avoid the awful suggestion that they are not inspired by the occasion. The television camera avoids the teleprompter, although all know by the glassy-eyed stare of the performer that it is there. Even artful speakers may contribute to the tradition of spontaneity; who would admit publicly how many hours he spent on a speech? The traditional response to felicitation is not, "Thanks,

[15] *Rhetoric*, 1414b.

[16] George Campbell, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric* (London, 1776), I, 1.

how I struggled on that manuscript," but, "You are very kind; really I didn't know what I was going to say when I got up." "True eloquence," wrote Gladstone in his younger days, will have "that living energy, which can only arise like a spark of fire from flint, out of the impact of mind with mind." It should be added that he believed in bringing along a good supply of ideological kindling, and that he acknowledged an eloquence of lower order, that "of the study."[17] It must be granted that a good audience, whether reading or listening, may inspire an artist to his fullest achievement in what he has previously prepared himself to do. Dr. Johnson, noting the poor quality of spontaneous prayer at service, recommended that the cleric call upon omnipotence prior to appearing before the congregation. "If he has any hope of supernatural help, why may he not as well receive it when he writes as when he speaks?"[18] Winston Churchill, remarking on his father's habit of writing out his spontaneous speeches beforehand, observed, "He had the knack of being able to foresee the occasion and he wrote not an essay or an argument but just the kind of harangue that would fit the mood of his audience." Although he wrote his speeches, Lord Randolph's "style was essentially rhetorical."[19] Other art forms have drawn upon spontaneity from time to time. The ballader improvised to flatter hosts and to deliver messages as he recited in the banquet halls. The minstrel Blondel improvised his songs as he searched for Richard along the Danube. In Italy, *commedia dell' arte* became celebrated and extinct as improvised comedy. Dadaism—spontaneity in painting—had a brief vogue in the twenties, but is now abandoned except for finger painting in the kindergarten, or as exercises in psychiatric treatment. Jazz is now established, but by the prepared compositions. In no art form other than speech is spontaneity celebrated. When the philharmonic comes to town it brings a score and knows it. How can we get rid of the popular notion that a speech is a nascent form, that it must be conceived and born publicly? Holders to the "rise to the occasion" school should someday collect a volume of worthy speeches so conceived and so dedicated; it might be a slim volume.

A second misconception comes from the "sell a bill of goods" school. Venerated is the "successful" speaker, the "put the point across" artist. Yes, he garbled the evidence, he cropped the pictures, he ran the gamut of fallacy, he was illiterate, he offended human intelligence—but he was "effective." It must be granted that a brush salesman has to sell brushes, and that the test of his subsistence is his success in salesmanship. There is a kind of vocational speaking which can be legitimately done and taught. But to make practical speechmaking the alpha and omega is to defy the best traditions of our subject. Great speeches are frequently "unsuccessful." We have preserved and venerated what Archbishop Cranmer said at the stake, what Sir Thomas More said before the scaffold. Woodrow Wilson did his best to establish a league to enforce peace. It was in a speech at Pueblo that he faltered, and his physical energies gave way. His clients, he said, were the next generation, not the immediate audience before him. For his "failure," millions of his clients paid in blood in World War II. Who failed that day in Pueblo?

[17] "Gladstone's Essay on Public Speaking," ed. Loren Reid, *QJS*, XXXIX (1953), 268.

[18] Samuel Johnson, "Ostig in Sky," *A Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland.*

[19] Winston Spencer Churchill, *Lord Randolph Churchill, M. P.* (London, 1906), I, 276.

Certainly not Wilson. The notion that a speaker must work miracles with an audience, that he must accommodate himself to their every whim, that he must "succeed" with them, lowers motive in speech. The assumption that the audience is always right may be a working principle of salesmanship, but it is dubious doctrine in humane values. If the poet, the painter accepted such a theory we would have only art appreciated at the moment by the mass. We do not respect the poet who writes for an immediate market without regard for his universal poetic impulses; we do not venerate the fiction writer who turns out pulp merely that it may sell; there is no more reason for admiring a speech writer who adjusts his ideas and his principles to win a temporary acceptance and "success."

A third kind of difficulty grows out of the "orality" of speeches. Because usually, somewhere in the stages from composition to inclusion in an anthology, the speech is spoken, it is possible to overemphasize this aspect. We even define a speech in terms of orality. How do we know this is a speech? Because it was delivered. And what was it that was delivered? It was a speech, because it was delivered. If we applied this method to a letter, we would classify anything in the mailbox, including seed catalogues and bills, as letters. But Chesterfield's letters are letters not because they were posted, but because they have that frankness, that spontaneous outpouring of the heart, the undisguised truth, the peculiar savour of the epistolary art; they have the substance, the form of letters. As well ask the postman to give a literary critique of Lady Montagu's letters as rely upon the janitor to identify something as a speech because it was actually spoken in his hall.

Having overemphasized the orality of speeches, we then tend to insist that the language of a speech must have a primitive transparency because it is spoken. The audience, the story goes, can not turn back, as in reading: it must comprehend at first hearing. "Written language must be ultimately intelligible to the reader," says the textbook; "spoken language must be *instantly* intelligible to the listener." Such observations sprinkle contemporary theory. They seem to come from the statement by Phillips in 1908: "The great essential in Oratorical Style is instant intelligibility,"[20] although the same characteristic was anciently noted. Plutarch tells the story of Lysias who wrote a speech for another. The receiver of the speech complained that although he thought well of it on first reading, the more frequently he read it, the less worthy it seemed. "Why," quoth Lysias, and smiled withal, "know you not that you are to pronounce it but once before the judges?"[21] Since Lysias and Phillips spoke there have come radio, television, tape recorders. Speeches may not only be heard repeatedly; they may be both seen and heard more than once. And for centuries speeches have been read and reread. Perspicuity is indeed a virtue, but the doctrine that in a speech the artist must lower his appeal to fit the dullest member of an audience hearing him at the moment is something of a deterrent to sublimity.

The doctrine of orality causes us to retreat from the speech as literature in still another way. It is the insistence on "oral style." But what is it? One writer says that "written discourse differs necessarily from spoken, being different

[20] Arthur Edward Phillips, *Effective Speaking* (Chicago, 1908), p. 181.
[21] Plutarch, "Of Garrulity," *Moralia*.

in word and phrase and structure." Having made this bold statement, he never mentions the subject again. Other writers are more specific. Oral style is not abstract, it is not abstruse, it is not fuzzy. It has good order, is clear, is communicative. In other words, good oral style differs from bad written style. But in what ways good oral style would differ from good written style is not made clear. Frequently specific distinctions are attempted. There is much question and answer in oral style as contrasted with written, say the textbooks. But, Paul's *Letters to the Corinthians* have much question and answer; his speech at Areopagus has little. The vocabulary in the speech is simple as contrasted with written forms, the advice goes. But the editors of John Donne's sermons observe: "The vocabulary used by Donne in the sermons is much larger than that employed in his poems. It includes such words as agnomination, binominous, superplusage."[22] There is more use of pronouns in speech, the theory goes. "First and second person pronouns show *unmistakably* that audience and speaker are face to face," says the textbook. The *Letters of Junius* abound in "I's" and "You's," yet we do not know even who wrote them. When a speech is actually spoken, of course, there may appear phrases such as "I now stand before you," in contrast to the "I take my pen in hand," of the letter. Such expressions are bits of evidence, not always conclusive, not matters of style. Wilbur Gilman analyzed Milton's *Areopagitica* and found it has "all the elements of a delivered address, except delivery itself."[23] It had, however, no orality. Gladys Borchers[24] analyzed passages oral and written for elements of distinction in style, but could find nothing significant. That oral differs from written style is a persistent notion. Aristotle noted that "The style of written prose is not that of spoken oratory."[25] We seem to have nothing brought to book, however, which would enable us to look at a page and tell whether it is in written or oral style. Perhaps the experimentalists will someday supply a code. About the best we can do now is say that if in some other forms of literature style is the man, in a speech, style is the man in relation to his audience.

The confusions growing out of the orality theory here discussed are not treated in any disparagement of artistry in elocution and delivery, nor of the virtues of oral communication. The advantages of discoursing directly, the sprightliness of repartee, the pleasure of being in a hall when a speaker enthralls an audience—these are beyond dispute. Nor is there any intention to suggest that the voice is not a great asset in discourse. The speaker may disentangle himself from a syntactical snarl by inflection, or perhaps finish an incomplete predication with a shrug. The presence of the man himself sometimes is excuse enough for going to meeting, even though the speaker may not have brought along a contribution to literature. As Trevelyan said of Gladstone, his "orations suffer in the reading from a quality which made them delightful to hear, their dependence on the skill of the speaker to effect his escape with grammar intact from the maze of parentheses—an operation safely sustained on that magnificent voice and by those

[22] George R. Potter and Evelyn M. Simpson (eds.), *The Sermons of John Donne* (Berkeley, 1953), I, 90.

[23] Wilbur E. Gilman, *Milton's Rhetoric: Studies in His Defense of Liberty* (Columbia, Missouri, 1939), p. 44.

[24] Gladys L. Borchers, "A Study of Oral Style" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Wisconsin, 1927), 2 vols.

[25] *Rhetorica*, 1413b.

dramatic gestures."[26] However, when we insist that a speech must have orality of style, and set up confused standards to define and test its excellence, then we make the speech something less than a form of literature.

3.

In our day there has been a general flight from the texts of speeches. There are books on public speaking which have no listing of "a speech" in the index. Rather the concern is for the "speech act," "the speech situation." Attention is given more and more to physiological and psychological matters, rather than literateness. "The text should be judged not as a work in its own right, but as the material from which a speech may be developed," says the textbook. "The real speech is not the draft prepared for eventual presentation; it is what the listener understands." Now how can the listener's understanding be preserved for posterity? "I believe in drastically minimizing, if not completely abolishing, any written procedures in preparing to speak," writes a speech teacher in a speech journal. "A good speech should be 'written' into the total musculature by actually talking it over and over again in advance of delivery." Another writer does not believe in even this kind of preparation; "find your words as you go, just as you do in conversation," he advises; "never subject your audience to a canned speech." These bits of counsel are more representative of the trend than of actual practice, probably. No doubt there are thousands of teachers still teaching speech composition, and there are many textbooks which teach appreciation of the speech.

Even where the speech as such is treated, however, there are attempts to divorce it from anything literary. "Public speaking," says the textbook, "is practical; it is a tool or instrument; it is not a fine art like painting and music." A set of directions issued by a regional speech association has this to say of eloquence: "Because of the sundry unpleasant associations which have clustered about the term 'oratory,' with its 19th-century frame of reference carried into the mid-20th century, it would be prudent to replace the label 'oratory' with one more connotatively acceptable, 'public speaking.'" The "unpleasant associations" are not described. Are they from Gladstone in Midlothian, Webster at Bunker Hill, Lincoln at Gettysburg? Probably the unpleasantness is associated with some of those pseudo-orations students used to give. But if we are to abandon every art form that has had horrors produced in its name, we should have no painting and sculpture, no poetry or music.

The flight from the texts of speeches is found, also, in the declining use in public speaking classes of model speeches having literary merit. The specimens studied now tend to be "representative" or "vital." Speech has followed the example of some other fields, in the past decades, and has set up normalcy rather than excellence as the goal. One would not want to have a style that suggested he was an egghead; so the pattern of discourse of the man on the corner is good enough. It is thought that the student who reads Webster might be ruined; he might try to speak publicly like an orator. Those little books for high school students, such as Burke's *Conciliation With The Colonies*,[27] containing logical brief,

[26] George Macaulay Trevelyan, *The Life of John Bright* (London, 1919), pp. 383-384.

[27] See Robert Andersen, *Conciliation With the Colonies—the Speech By Edmund Burke* (Boston, 1896).

rhetorical plan and principles, notes on setting and allusions, detailed attention to the text, look quaint indeed today.

But even where literature as such is not feared, in the field of oral interpretation of literature, speeches as such are seldom studied. Books on reading and elocution—including McGuffey—used to contain many speeches and excerpts from speeches. The textbook Franklin Roosevelt studied at Harvard, George Riddle's *A Modern Reader and Speaker* (1899), has a section titled "Orations" which takes up one third of the book. But contemporary textbooks in interpretation, and readers, give less and less attention to the speech as a literary form. This is difficult to explain. Perhaps the interpreters have delegated the literature of speeches to the teachers of public speaking. Or perhaps interpreters fear the old association of speeches as declamations. The explanation does not seem to be that they have discovered worthier examples of literature.

The desertion of the speech text is seen especially in collections of literature made by teachers of English. This decline has been traced by Barnet Baskerville[28] in an article in *QJS* four years ago. As he points out, one writer on literature extols the orators in his edition of 1897, but finds no place for them in the edition of 1935. A writer on *Literary Aims and Art*, in 1927, found room for seventy-six pages on the drama, but only for three on oratory, although he acknowledged that "Oratory takes its natural place among literary forms."[29] The anthologies in English literature still accord some recognition of speeches, especially in the seventeenth century. But generally speaking, the English professors have abandoned the field of rhetoric, out of which their departments grew, and have consigned it to Speech. They may have to re-enter the field.

Collections of speeches are still made, of course, but without much interest in text. The speech is given, frequently, without identification of text or nature of text—whether predelivery, edited after delivery, stenographic, recorded, rewritten by another, state of completeness, etc. Texts are seldom collated or identified in the classical tradition. The concern Carlyle[30] showed for Cromwell's texts and John Forster[31] bestowed on the speeches of Sir John Eliot is now something rare.

Three decades ago Herbert Wichelns, in his *Literary Criticism of Oratory*,[32] described the narrow view most literary critics were bringing to rhetoric. They were concerned, he maintained, mainly with belle lettres, with written-down and enduring rhetoric, rather than with the rhetoric of practical affairs to be found in political speaking and pamphleteering. He called for more attention to the social setting of rhetoric, to the specific conditions under which it came to be. Richard Cobden, for example, was a noble figure in practical, effective speechmaking. He got the Corn Laws abolished. But what enduring value he has is mainly historical rather than literary. Professor Wichelns' words were heeded. Since then, there has been prodigious study in social

[28] "The Place of Oratory in American Literature," *QJS*, XXXIX (1953), 459-464.

[29] Harrison R. Steeves, *Literary Aims and Art* (New York, 1927), pp. 233-235.

[30] Thomas Carlyle, *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches: With Elucidations* (London, 1845), 2 vols.

[31] John Forster, *Sir John Eliot: A Biography* (London, 1872), 2 vols.

[32] Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," originally in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York, 1925), reprinted in *The Rhetorical Idiom: Essays in Rhetoric, Oratory, Language, and Drama Presented to Herbert August Wichelns*, ed. Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca and London, 1958), pp. 5-42.

setting of speeches, in training of speakers, in biographical details of speakers, but precious little in literary appreciation of great speeches. For a model of that we still have to go back a hundred years to Chauncey Goodrich. Now Wichelns agreed that rhetorical and literary criticism often overlap, and he was not decrying literary appreciation. He was pleading against the neglect of the other concerns. If Wichelns could write of the neglect of rhetorical criticism thirty years ago, we may speak of the neglect of literary criticism of speeches today.

All this is not to disparage what our contemporary rhetorical critics are doing in their studies of the political, the sociological, the psychological. The point is that speech as a literary form and the literary criticism of speeches face extinction. No doubt the literary classifiers in the nineteenth century overdid it. Whether one should be able to distinguish an epizeuxis from an epanalepsis may be open to question. But the rhetorical critics of today should know something of figure and trope, should be able to name some of the devices which are found in speeches, to do something more than say, "The speaker used grammatical sentences."

4.

Traditionally the speech has been regarded as a literary form. It has been held that if one would appreciate the speeches in the Bible, in Virgil, in Shakespeare, one must know something about the speech as literary genre. If one would appreciate the literature of sermons and political speeches, he must know something of this type of literature.

The speech as a form of literature receives less and less attention in our day. The explanation is not that the speech has lost its significance, but that the attention of literary critics has been directed to other areas. The speech as literature now seems to be a primary concern of neither teachers of English nor teachers of Speech.

The plea here is not for restriction of our subject to its classical origins. Rather, it is to restore in part what was once the center of the discipline. Nor is this an appeal to bring back appreciation of speeches at the state where decline began. Speech as literature should be a dynamic, moving force. The student of the novel views his subject as more than the study of Dickens, although Dickens has been preserved. There is a contemporary novel, studied as literature. Other forms of art, the poem, the painting, have their regenerative movements, as new forms and new practices are tried and perfected. The possibilities of a "new" appreciation of the speech are here only suggested. Much remains to be discovered in ways of making and appreciating contemporary speech forms. Perhaps the "New Rhetoric" will give us greater view.

To the extent that study and oral interpretation of speeches decline, literature and the humanities are the poorer. The speech as a form gives us a microcosm of humanity, a man in high thought and feeling, in a worthy cause, seeking, by his word-artistry, to make his audience know and care. In the best of the past speeches we have these experiences preserved as illuminations of man's experience, and of the best in human nature. It is a pity not to draw freely upon this heritage.

# THE DEBATE ABOUT DEBATING

Douglas Ehninger

1.

THROUGHOUT its history of more than six decades interschool debating has proved a fruitful subject for controversy. Hence, it should occasion no surprise to find in our journals during the past few years sporadic altercations over one of its most popular current practices—that of requiring a team in a tournament to debate the two sides of a proposition alternately.

Since the proponents as well as the critics of this change-sides procedure have already spoken at length, I do not propose to extend this argument. Rather, my purpose is to examine the conflicting cases critically, and to investigate the basic issue upon which they turn.

2.

So far as I have been able to determine, the first person to get into print with a full-dress criticism of the change-sides policy was Brooks Quimby of Bates College. In the now defunct *Speech Activities* magazine in the summer of 1953, he charged that the practice was neither useful pedagogically nor defensible ethically.[1] A year later in an essay published by the *New York Times Magazine* in connection with the refusal of certain colleges to debate the "Red China proposition," James MacGregor Burns, the Williams College political scientist, also took occasion to criticize the policy.[2] Then at the close of 1956, Quimby's article, together with a reply by Arthur N. Kruger, was reprinted in the *Bulletin of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges,* and within a month the matter was given a much wider audience by Richard Murphy in a vigorous criticism of the practice which appeared in *The Speech Teacher.*[3] Murphy's article, in turn, was answered by Nicholas Cripe in the next number of the same journal, which also carried a rejoinder by Murphy.[4] In *The Speech Teacher* for last November a Letter to the Editor, by Donald K. Smith, refined and somewhat further developed a number of the arguments advanced by Cripe.[5] And finally, as of this writing—although more pieces threaten to break forth momentarily—we have in the same journal for January, 1958, a short essay by George W. Dell specifically attacking certain of Murphy's major propositions.[6]

*Mr. Ehninger (Ph.D., Ohio State University, 1949) is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Florida. He is a past editor of* The Southern Speech Journal, *has been Editor for New Books for* QJS, *and is now again an associate editor.*

[1] Brooks Quimby, "But Is It Educational?" *Speech Activities,* IX (Summer 1953), 30-31.

[2] James MacGregor Burns, "Debate Over Collegiate Debates," *New York Times Magazine,* December 5, 1954, pp. 12, 30.

[3] Arthur N. Kruger, "Is It Educational? Yes," *Bulletin of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges,* XXII (December 1956), 4-9; Richard Murphy, "The Ethics of Debating Both Sides," *The Speech Teacher,* VI (January 1957), 1-9.

[4] Nicholas M. Cripe, "Debating Both Sides in Tournaments Is Ethical," *The Speech Teacher,* VI (September 1957), 209-212; Richard Murphy, "Debating Both Sides," *ibid.,* pp. 255-256.

[5] Donald K. Smith, "Debating Both Sides," *The Speech Teacher,* VI (November 1957), 336.

[6] George W. Dell, "In Defense of Debating Both Sides," *The Speech Teacher,* VII (January 1958), 31-34.

Of the various statements published by those who oppose the practice, Murphy's essay as supplemented by his rejoinder to Cripe is the fullest and by far the most thoughtful. In the interests of fairness and convenience, therefore, the cause of the critics may be summarized by reviewing Murphy's argument.

3.

The heart of the case against changing sides, as Murphy presents it, dips to the dialectical level and rests squarely upon what he calls a "simple"—and evidently regards as an irrefutable—"principle": "Debate . . . is a form of public speaking. A public statement is a public commitment. Before one takes the platform he should study the question, he should discuss it until he knows where he stands. Then he should take that stand."[7]

In support of this principle, Murphy has recourse to the argument from sign. Consider, he says, the whole tenor, form, and movement of a typical school debate. Does it not in all respects appear to be "geared to the public platform . . . to rhetorical, rather than dialectical principles"? Are not the questions employed "specific and timely" rather than "speculative and universal"? Do not the debaters rely "heavily on the use of authority and opinion"? Do they not consciously employ *ethos?* Do they not speak "the language of the audience," appealing as forcibly as they can for "judgment and acceptance"? Since it is obvious that they do; since school debating as it is practiced today purports to be "a method of the platform," with all the platform's characteristic conventions and phrases, Murphy argues, it must of necessity submit to the contemporary ethic of the platform. And this, by common consent and established practice, no less than by the minimum standards of public decency, is the proposition enunciated above—"a public utterance is a public commitment."[8]

With a *prima facie* case thus made out by appeal to dialectical principle Murphy is content to ascend to the rhetorical level and to defend his ground by considering in turn nine so-called "philosophical" arguments which he alleges are commonly advanced by members of the change-sides school. He finds each argument either invalid or irrelevant. As for the more practical considerations of "administrative or pedagogical convenience," these, he says, must be evaluated in terms of one's "views of the philosophical and ethical matters."[9]

In conclusion Murphy returns once again to the realm of "principle," arguing, first, that the willingness to uphold either side of a disputable question indifferently is not now and never has been an essential ingredient of any sort of debating—legislative, forensic, or school; and, second, that instead of falling into the easy error of letting our ethics be shaped by the exigencies of practice, we must take care to bring our practice into line with our ethics.[10]

The change-siders, on the contrary, while touching upon a large number of arguments in passing, in each case eventually come to rest on a direct denial of Murphy's major premise. What is said in a school debate does not, they claim, constitute "a public commitment." Tournament debating is different from "other forms of argumentative speaking." Murphy's ethic,

[7] Murphy, "The Ethics of Debating Both Sides," p. 2.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 3-8.

[10] Murphy, "Debating Both Sides," p. 255.

of course, applies "to argument in the pulpit, in the legislative halls, in the courtroom, and in the market place"; it does not, however, apply to the argumentative speaking done in a debate tournament.[11] Indeed, the "most obvious" fact about tournament debating, they say, is that it is different from these other forms of speaking. It is a "pedagogical device . . . for giving a relatively large number of students a relatively intense experience in using reasoned discourse."[12]

Everyone connected with the activity—coaches, judges, school administrators, and the debaters themselves—clearly recognizes this fact. Moreover, so runs the case, no one supposes that when he engages in school debating he is employing all of the skills "needed for effective participation in the public address of American society." Tournament debating, with its emphasis on reasoned discourse, is admittedly only a "part skill." But as a "part skill" it represents that aspect of the total complex of persuasion that is of greatest value and importance in the sound functioning of a democratic society. This, therefore, is the aspect of persuasion which speech education should be particularly concerned with fostering and developing.[13]

As for the morals of the matter, say the change-siders, it should be made clear that in rejecting the ethic governing those forms of oral communication that are "public," school debate does not divorce itself entirely from ethical moorings, for it has it own internal morality—an ethic determined by its own nature and purpose. First, we may believe that anyone will be "a better man for having been a good debater—more aware of the dishonesty of irrational appeals and more ethical in his approach to argument"; and, second and more important, the moral responsibility of the school debater will be adequately discharged if he adheres to the principle that once a cause has been undertaken it is his obligation to present "the best case he can for his proposition, within the limits of the facts as he knows or believes them to be."[14]

4.

In passing from exposition to analysis, I should observe first, I think, that the argumentation of neither party will always bear the test of close scrutiny.

Murphy, for example, not only resorts to rhetorical argument as the major defense for what is obviously a dialectical principle, but in doing so employs a strangely indirect and negative method. Insofar as he attempts to support his position by denying admissibility to the various arguments advanced in favor of the change-sides policy, he is striving, in effect, to maintain it not by developing constructive or affirmative proof, but by parrying all reasonable attacks. Thus he appears to say, "I am right because you cannot prove me wrong." Moreover, it certainly deserves mention that both in his original essay and in his rejoinder to Cripe he fails to name the persons by whom these arguments are allegedly advanced. Therefore, we are never able to judge how numerous, well informed, or discerning "they" are. Consequently we cannot estimate the weight that should properly be given to "their" views.

Second, it might also be charged that in his eagerness to condemn the change-

[11] Cripe, "Debating Both Sides in Tournaments Is Ethical," p. 209.
[12] Smith, "Debating Both Sides," p. 336.
[13] *Ibid.*
[14] Kruger, "Is It Educational? Yes," p. 8; Cripe, "Debating Both Sides in Tournaments Is Ethical," p. 212.

sides procedure Murphy is at times guilty of what appears to be considerable over-statement. He implies, but without supporting evidence, that "an ethic has been imposed" upon nearly all of school debate, that "one must either debate both sides or not debate at all." Yet one would certainly be more just in saying that despite the growth of the change-sides practice, the great majority of our school and college tournaments are still of the traditional type in which each team upholds only one side of the question. Any coach, therefore, who desires to do so may find an abundance of activity for his debaters without attending the change-sides affairs.

And lastly, one could, I believe, raise some serious questions concerning Murphy's master ethic—that a public statement is a public commitment. Is not the emphasis here so exclusively on ends that means are largely disregarded? Does Murphy mean that so long as one advances only propositions in which he believes, he may argue them in any way he chooses, with or without regard to the nature of the appeals employed? And how about the ends themselves? Should a "public" speaker be free to proclaim any proposition which he believes to be true, without regard to the safety and well being of society? These, it seems to me, are fundamental questions which I do not find answered in the argument which Murphy presents.

As for the proponents of the change-sides policy, upon a critical examination, much of what they say will be found, I believe, irrelevant to the principal point at issue. For while Murphy's objections lie almost exclusively in the area of ethics, their answers are in large measure couched in terms of pedagogical advantage—that debating both sides gives one a better understanding of the side in which he does not believe, makes him more sensitive to the weaknesses in his own position, or produces better all-round debaters.

Moreover, if, as I have suggested, Murphy attempts to support his dialectic rhetorically, there can be little question that the attack made upon it by his opponents is almost entirely on the rhetorical level—first, in their resort to arguments from expediency and circumstance, and second, in their marked tendency to proceed inartistically by piling up the opinions of authorities.

Finally, if Murphy's ethic is censurable as emphasizing ends at the expense of means, that advanced by the change-siders is, on the contrary, open to the charge that it unwarrantably stresses means at the expense of ends. For while it may all be very well to be guided by the rule that once a cause is undertaken the advocate shall speak neither more or less than the facts as he knows or believes them, such a dictum contains no directions or standards concerning what sort of cause may and what sort of cause may not legitimately be assumed.

But while there are, in my judgment, these and similar defects in the argumentation developed by both parties, the basic cases which they present have the virtue of pointing up with admirable clarity the crucial difference of opinion upon which the dispute as a whole turns: Is school debating a mode of public address or a pedagogical device—a creature of the platform or of the classroom?

Since this is the central question in the controversy, rather than pursue further the intricacies of the opposing arguments, I propose to concentrate at-

tention upon it throughout the remainder of this article.

5.

Although the fact is frequently dissembled, to call debating a "pedagogical device" is in reality only a more polite and formal—perhaps a less pointed and painful—way of saying, "Debating is a game or contest played for educational purposes." It is, therefore, in terms of this more precise and earthy formulation that the basic position of the change-siders must be examined.

Within these terms, let us begin by observing two characteristics of games in general. First, and without exception, games possess a certain artificial or contrived quality. They are devised or invented constructs, and thus are always, and even at best, at least one step removed from "reality"—from the actual world of men and events in which we live and move and carry on affairs. The very fact that nearly all games have elaborate printed codes of rules and regulations, with stated fouls and penalty points, may be taken as *prima facie* evidence of this aspect of their nature. Put differently, there is not, and cannot be, a completely natural, inartificial, or realistic game. There are only those that approximate the real world more closely or more faithfully than others. And if this be doubted, observe that even the game of "courtship" is surrounded in all cultures with an elaborate web of man-made custom and tradition.

Second, games are, for the most part certainly, associated with the values we call "winning" and "losing"—with victory and defeat. Moreover, these values adhere not to the objects, tools, or materials used in playing, but to the individuals or persons participating. Thus it is "I" or "we" or "you" or "they," or at least "someone," who always does the winning or losing. In fact, when the victory or defeat of an idea takes precedence over the victory or defeat of an individual we customarily cease to regard the situation as a "game" and begin to view it as an aspect of the "real life" struggle.

If, then, these are general characteristics of all games, let us now look more closely at school debating conceived of and played as a game.

Here I think we must say—and this, incidentally, appears to be what the change-siders also maintain—it is a game which has for its principal purpose the matching of acquired abilities, skills, and techniques. This, of course, does not mean facts and information do not enter in a very material way into any sort of good debating, no matter what we suppose its nature and purpose to be. My point is that unlike quiz shows and parlor games where the mere piling up of facts may be an end in itself, in debating facts are but grist to the mill of argument; so that the crucial test is not how many facts a speaker has but rather what use he makes of them. Since the tools or instruments by which facts are manipulated and put to work in argument are those habits, faculties, and formulas which we call "skills" or "techniques," the conclusion seems inescapable: If school debating is a game, it is a game in which we are chiefly concerned with the matching of skills and techniques. As the average tournament ballot suggests, these lie in the areas of "analysis," "adaptation," "refutation," and the like.

I have devoted the preceding paragraph to demonstrating why, in my judgment, if school debating is to be regarded as a game it must more particularly be regarded as a game of

skills and techniques, because I wish to advance the proposition that while the game concept itself opens the way to serious moral and social defects, debating as a contest in techniques also embraces grave pedagogical evils. Let us consider the two specifications of this charge in reverse order.

The pedagogical evils involved in the concept of debating as a game of techniques are, I believe, at least two. First, such a concept tends to upset the balance that must exist between techniques and subject matter in any sort of sound rhetorical instruction. Techniques, instead of retaining their proper station as the handmaidens of ideas, become ends in themselves, with the result that the goals of training are guided primarily, or perhaps exclusively, toward their acquirement.

This, in turn, has the effect of fragmentizing instruction in what should properly be the whole of the unified and complete rhetorical process. For as the Platonic Socrates artfully reminded us more than two thousand years ago, the acquirement of techniques is only the first step in learning to write or speak well. What we must know is when and how and where to use our skills, and when to refrain from using them. And this in the fullest sense requires not only the psychologist's knowledge of the "soul" of the listener, but also the good man's knowledge of and dedication to the moral standards and social needs of the group. In short, any sort of rhetorical instruction that divorces a study of techniques from application in this widest sense represents a partialism that is as dangerous as it is fruitless.

Second, if modern speech education has taught us anything it is that students learn the skills of "real-life" oral discourse most easily and surely by practicing them in situations that are measurably like those they will encounter outside the classroom. Yet to practice school debating as a game of techniques—as one in which success or failure is measured not in terms of persuasion, but in terms of how well one performs certain expected routines—is to introduce another strong element of artificiality into a situation from which, because of the narrow time limits, the assigned nature of subject matter, etc., reality has already in some measure unavoidably been abstracted.

When this heightened sense of unreality is combined with the tendency to emphasize techniques at the expense of subject matter, it is difficult to see how effective, realistic instruction in responsible oral discourse is possible.

If the lessons of history are valid, the practice of techniques in such a hothouse atmosphere will accomplish only one thing: it will make the student proficient in the use of those techniques in that atmosphere. Moreover, as techniques are cut loose from the restraining control of subject matter and are themselves made the criteria by which performance is judged and applause won, they tend to become ever more esoteric, elaborate, and far-fetched. The striving for the new, the unusual, the startling, the melodramatic becomes increasingly pronounced. Public speaking gradually degenerates into an exercise in virtuosity.

If, then, these are the pedagogical evils which, as I believe, are embedded in the concept of debating as a game of techniques, what are the moral and social defects present in the game concept?

In a thoughtful essay which appeared in this journal nearly twenty years ago, Lester Thonssen wrote: "I do not believe that debating is a game. But if

anyone makes it such, then it is up to us to watch it closely. For it becomes a game which it is, unfortunately, easy to play unfairly."[15] And this judgment, I fear, is true. I know of no game—of cards or dice, or of the parlor or playing field—in which it is easier to cheat if one chooses to do so, and to escape detection.

Nor are the reasons obscure. Because the evidence involved is always extensive, complex, and confusing, sometimes even self-contradictory; because the time limits are confining; because judge and audience usually know less about the subject than does the speaker; because the paths of mediate inference open the way for conscious as well as unconscious sophistry; because stratagems and calculated advantages are difficult to detect and time-consuming to expose—for these and other reasons, school debating presents numerous opportunities for suppressing, distorting, or slanting the truth, and for escaping discovery or refutation.

By this I do not mean to imply that these malpractices are inherent in debating or that they are always present. I do believe, however, that when debating is played as a game, and consequently, with the feeling that everything one says is just for fun or practice and doesn't really matter anyway, they are potential to the degree that the activity requires constant policing of the most vigilant kind.

But let us give the matter every advantage of doubt. Let us assume that policing is thoroughly and effectively done; that in playing the game no student among the thousands who participate in debating every year ever suppresses or distorts the most trivial piece of evidence, ever reasons incorrectly, or ever says anything that he does not fully and earnestly believe. What do we have as a result of all of our careful policing? What, that is, besides the constant humiliation and unpleasantness of being policed? Can we now write school debating a clean bill of moral and social health? There are several reasons why I do not believe that we can.

First, I would submit, debating played as a game, even when it preserves the highest standards of personal and social responsibility, makes little or no direct contribution to the solving of mankind's present and future problems. At a time when as perhaps never before all free men must stand together for their very survival, debating played as a game deliberately turns its back on our collective responsibilities. It may be that the average school debater or even all the school debaters in the country put together can do little to influence public opinion into those courses of action upon which the preservation of our nation and our lives may depend. That is not the point. In refusing to shoulder a part of this obligation school debating openly renounces any possibility of helping. Confining itself to a world of unreality as removed as were the schools of the Sophistic, it deliberately leaves the task to others. Thousands of young men and women who, because of their intellectual equipment and native endowment, are peculiarly fitted to lead are denied the duty and privilege of doing so. If nothing else, they should at least, it would seem, be taught the importance of making up their own minds and of being willing to stand by what they say. (And if, by chance, it be argued that while they admittedly are

[15] Lester Thonssen, "The Social Values of Discussion and Debate," *QJS*, XXV (February 1939), 116.

not making a contribution now, they are being trained to do so in the future, I would again call attention to the proposition that those who divorce techniques from application in any area of rhetorical education at the very least bear the burden of proving that they actually are providing sound training for future social usefulness.)

But not only does debating played as a game renounce its obligations to society as a whole; it also fails to realize debating's potentials for developing in the participants themselves the social and moral traits that will be required of them as men and women. For, surely, one of the traits which we have every right to expect of mature individuals is that they be able to face up to personal and group problems realistically. But while debating properly taught may be an important means of developing this ability, playing it as a game deliberately fosters a habit of not facing up, of taking some of the most serious and pressing problems facing society, and simply playing at the solving of them as if they were party pastimes. Pointedly and perhaps cruelly—though, I think, not unfairly—put, it is as if one were to play soldier with a wooden gun while the enemy invades the shores.

Moreover, one is tempted to ask, what effect does such a policy of not facing up—of systematic withdrawal from reality, of organized and socially approved pretending—have upon the character and personality of an individual when it is extended over a period of months or years? Even if one always acts with scrupulous honesty, may not prolonged play-acting with such problems have the effect of holding him in a state of suspended puerility? As James MacGregor Burns says in the essay I have already cited: "Ultimately the task of a free society is to confront, rather than evade, the vital questions of choice that loom up. Ultimately this is the test of debating, too."[16] Is it not high time that the truth and significance of this judgment be realized?

In short, in a world such as ours the crucial moral question to be asked about school debating is, it seems to me, simply this: Do we practice it in such a way that it makes its greatest possible contribution to the young men and women who participate in it and to the society of which they are members? Our nation and world today cannot afford the luxury of any educational activity that pleads its case on the narrow ground that it is ethically neutral—that it does no social or moral harm. Nor can it afford one that makes anything less than its maximum contribution. Debating must be more than a convenient means for stimulating research or for teaching the techniques of argument. Any pursuit that involves the time, money, and energy it does must be a positive force for good. It must contribute in a direct and effective way to the making of better men and women and the building of a better world.

Thus the case, as I see it, is clear. The game concept of school debating not only embraces serious pedagogical evils, but it is unacceptable socially and morally. "Free minds and free men," says Grover A. Fuchs, "cannot exist without widespread understanding of, and support for, the ethics which make freedom of thought and expression a workable concept."[17] Debating played as a game contributes neither to that understanding, nor to that support.

[16] Burns, "Debate Over Collegiate Debates," p. 30.

[17] Grover A. Fuchs, "About Speech Contests," *The Speech Teacher*, III (January 1954), 58

6.

If, then, the contention that school debating is a "pedagogical device" is the hinge upon which the change-siders choose to turn their case, that case, I believe, must be rejected. As so many others have done before them, they have accepted without sufficient examination a basic principle that is indefensible educationally, and unacceptable socially and morally.[18] The plain fact of the matter, it seems to me, is that anything that can be taught by playing debating as a game can be taught, and taught better, by practicing it as a mode of "real life" oral discourse; and, in addition, practicing it in this way will make a far greater contribution to the total development of the students who participate in it and to the salvation of the society in which they live.

But, over and above this, I would also urge that "the game concept of debating" which over the years has so often arisen to plague us, be once and for all put to rest. If in the face of a developing scientism in education school debating may ever be called upon to fight for its existence, I should hope it would stand on firmer ground than that provided by the game concept and its dubious offspring, the change-sides practice.

[18] See in this connection Lew Sarett, "A Juryman-Critic's Vote," *QJSE*, IV (October 1918), 432; Wayne Thompson, "Discussion and Debate: A Re-Examination," *QJS*, XXX (October 1944), 293-295; Wilder W. Crane, "The Function of Debate," *The Central States Speech Journal*, V (Fall 1953), 16-18; Dale D. Drum, "The Debate Judge as a Machine," *Today's Speech*, IV (April 1956), 28-31.

• • •

# RICHARD SIBBES'S THEORY AND PRACTICE OF PERSUASION

Roy F. Hudson

RICHARD SIBBES' remarks on persuasion can claim a place among the significant rhetorical pronouncements from important and influential leaders in seventeenth-century England and America. With him the epithet "heavenly" is associated as invariably as "venerable" is with Bede, "judicious" with Hooker, or "holy" with Baxter.

Sibbes was a native of Suffolk, the Puritan county of old England that furnished many lustrous emigrants to New England. Soon after his graduation from St. John's College, Cambridge, Sibbes accepted the Trinity lectureship. At Cambridge John Cotton, perhaps the most famous and influential Puritan preacher in the American colonies prior to Cotton Mather, heard him and was so "effectually awakened" that he later attributed his conversion to Puritanism to Sibbes's preaching.[1] Cotton came to venerate Sibbes, and there can be little doubt that he was influenced by Sibbes from that time on.[2]

The popularity of Sibbes in his own day is attested to by the positions he held—preacher at Gray's Inn, Master of Catherine Hall in Cambridge, and Vicar of Trinity. While preaching at Cambridge, he was heard by many notable persons who were impressed by his sermons: John Milton, Jeremy Taylor, George Herbert, Thomas Fuller, and the future president of Harvard University, Charles Chauncey. John Davenport, Thomas Hooker, and Samuel Stone are among the New England Puritans who testify to the greatness of Sibbes and to his lasting influence.[3]

The remarks of Sibbes, being those of a man great in his own day, must have had marked effect on Puritans. Therefore an examination of his remarks on persuasion should offer some insight into the theory and practice of homiletic persuasion both in Puritan England and Puritan New England.

This paper is a compilation and ordering, with a minimum of interpretation, of Sibbes's scattered remarks on persuasion from his published works—sermons, lectures, prefaces, and letters. The result may serve as a working reconstruction of Sibbes's theory and practice. No further claim is made for the present undertaking.[4]

*Mr. Hudson (Ph.D., Cornell, 1953) teaches in the Department of Literature and Language Arts at the Modesto Junior College, Modesto, California.*

[1] Cotton Mather, *Magnalia Christi Americana*, folio ed. (1702), p. 15, chapter 1, paragraph 5.

[2] Thomas Allen, who heard Cotton lecture in Boston every fifth day in the week for thirteen years, states that Cotton used Dr. Sibbes as a model. Thomas Allen in preface to John Cotton's *An Exposition on the 13th Chapter of Revelation* (London, 1655).

[3] Alexander B. Grosart, "Memoir of Richard Sibbes, D.D.," in *The Complete Works of Richard Sibbes, D.D.*, ed. Alexander Balloch Grosart (Edinburgh, 1862-64), I, xxi, xxii, xxxvii, li, cxi, cxvii. All future references to Sibbes's words will be made to this edition, hereinafter referred to as *Works*.

[4] The interpretation of these findings could be the subject of an extensive treatise, especially the relation of these findings to American seventeenth-century preaching. Much of what Sibbes has to offer is commonplace seventeenth-century doctrine; some of it is distinctly Sibbesian and could stand close scrutiny and evaluation. The relation of Sibbes's theory and practice to seventeenth-century rhetoric and

## The Definition of Persuasion

A reconstruction of Sibbes's theory of persuasion might well begin with definition. Definition presents some difficulty—that of adequate synthesis—which may be offset by uncovering at the outset the individuality of our author's homiletic thinking. Sibbes's clarification of terms is not confined to any one sermon or lecture, but is found in passages scattered through his works like truffles in a field. They must be dug out, gathered, and sorted before they can be presented to the reader. To some extent, this same dispersion applies to the other elements as well as to his theory of persuasion. Nowhere does Sibbes quote an authority for his definitions, although Aristotelian and Augustinian influences can be noted. One imagines that if Sibbes were asked for his sources, the "heavenly" man would reply that his definitions combined the classical and homiletic theories he learned at Cambridge with his practical experience.

On first attempting to synthesize the clarifications of terms Sibbes provides, we arrive at something like the following: Persuasion is the psychological change produced in a listener by the logical and emotional arguments of a speaker operating on the listener's conscience and on his previously prepared mind. This definition becomes clearer as one becomes better acquainted with Sibbes's concept of persuasion, which embodies conviction, stimulation, and spiritual acceptance.

CONVICTION. Conviction, according to Sibbes, is audience-based. It is concerned with the general and particular interest of the audience. General conviction is the state in which the hearer finds himself when "he cannot tell what to say against the truth." He has exhausted, silently or orally, all the arguments he has against the proposition being presented to him. Particular conviction is accomplished when the hearer is "persuaded of his own interest" in the proposition.[5] He has not yet accepted the proposition, but he has no arguments against it and finds he has a personal interest in it. This is Sibbes's meaning of general and personal, or particular, conviction.

STIMULATION. Stimulation, in distinction to conviction, is speaker-based. Like conviction, it has two classifications—general and particular. General stimulation aims to arouse the auditor to realize that "the truth is so." Particular stimulation awakens the hearer to the realization that he has an interest in the proposition being proposed, "that he has a portion in it." The results of the speaker's stimulating suasion is the hearer's apprehension of "the truth and goodness" of the proposition and his practical relation of this truth to himself.[6]

INSTABILITY OF PERSUASION. Although the hearer's conviction may be won and he may realize the personal benefits of the proposition, unless Spirit accompanies the process his position is very unstable. Without "supernatural per-

homiletics can be seen by an examination of such works as: Wilbur S. Howell, *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700* (Princeton, 1956); Perry Miller, *The New England Mind* (New York, 1939); William P. Sandford, *English Theories of Public Address, 1530-1828* (Ohio State University Press, 1929); Caroline F. Richardson, *English Preachers and Preaching, 1640-1670* (London, 1928); W. Fraser Mitchell, *English Pulpit Oratory from Andrewes to Tillotson* (London, 1932); Ruth B. Bozell, *English Preachers of the 17th Century* (Unpublished Cornell Ph.D. Thesis, 1939); Edwin C. Dargan, *A History of Preaching 1572-1900* (New York, 1912); Babette M. Levy, *Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History* (New York, 1945); Charles Smyth, *The Art of Preaching* (London, 1953).

[5] These quotations are from Sibbes's discussion of conviction found in "Faith Triumphant," *Works*, VII, 428.

[6] *Works*, VII, 428-29.

suasion" the hearer's conviction can easily be shaken by counter arguments. His interest may fluctuate and he may even reject the proposition. When opposing suggestions arise, the listener may become disobedient, desperate, or even apostate.

> If the soul be not persuaded by the Spirit of God, together with the Spirit of the Scripture; for the same Spirit that is in the Scripture must be in our spirit, working our natures suitable to the Scriptures to be holy: we do not, by that Spirit by which the Scripture was indited, know those truths, WE SHALL NEVER BE OBEDIENT TO THEM, NOT CONSTANTLY.[7]

Therefore Sibbes insists upon a third and indispensable part of persuasion. "There is a secret messenger that goes with the outward speech both of the preacher and of the Scripture, or else all the arguments will not be to purpose; they will be of no efficacy."[8]

SPIRITUAL ACCEPTANCE. It will be recalled that conviction left the hearer with no objections to the proposition, while stimulation aroused him to the truth and goodness of the proposition. But nothing so far has actuated him to *accept* the proposition. Acceptance is the objective of what Sibbes terms "Spirit" in persuasion. Lacking modern psychological terminology, Sibbes describes the working of "Spirit" as the upheaval produced in the mind of the hearer by the entire conviction-stimulation experience which is necessary to influence the will for acceptance.[9]

SPIRITUAL MOTIVATION. Divine persuasion is accomplished through motivation, mortification, and exaltation. Motivation functions through certain natural laws. It is a basic principle, says Sibbes, that when one discovers a good "out of one's self" one reaches out to embrace it.[10] It is natural for the eye to delight in beautiful objects, just as it is natural for the understanding to delight in true things, and for the will to delight in things that are good, delightfully good, or spiritually and conveniently good. Conversely, it is natural to dislike that which is inconvenient and harmful. Therefore the very existence of a truth opens the understanding and assures its intelligent functioning. The existence of beauty and good works upon man's disposition and makes him teachable.[11]

MORTIFICATION AND EXALTATION. Man, however, will not be moved to acceptance unless there has been an activity in the conscience. The hearer must experience mortification and exaltation. He will experience mortification when his natural dislike of the inconvenient and harmful is turned upon his own malicious, lustful, and evil acts. After mortification, exaltation is experienced when man allows his natural delight in the spiritually and conveniently good to dwell upon those things which it is possible for him to attain. The speaker may aid this activity, but the hearer must himself experience mortification and exaltation. The hearer's reason may be of aid here also, but it is the fusion of the total experience of conviction and stimulation which produces the final inclination of the will. Only with the completion of this final action can the hearer be said to be persuaded.

RESTATEMENT OF DEFINITION. Sibbes's definition of persuasion becomes clear when we realize he is defining persuasion by its process. Persuasion is a progressive inclination of the hearer's will, begun by exhausting all rebuttals to the

[7] *Works*, VII, 432.
[8] *Works*, VII, 436.
[9] Sibbes's discussion of the work of Spirit in the persuasion process is contained in his "Faith Triumphant," *Works*, VII, 429-37.
[10] *Works*, VII, 439.
[11] Sibbes's discussion of the natural laws is contained in his "Faith Triumphant," *Works*, VII, 439-441.

proposition, furthered by the strong reasoning and emotional appeals of the speaker, and completed by the working of mortification and exaltation in the conscience of the hearer.

### The Purpose of Persuasion

Sibbes allows only one purpose for persuasion — conversion. He believes that conviction is an incomplete goal, that stimulation falls short of achieving the goal. Without these two, however, persuasion would be impossible. The Sibbesian aim of persuasion is to change a man's habits—to induce him to discard unchristian habits and to accept and practice a way of life consistent with Christian principles. Sibbes knew, as every rhetorician knows, that this is one of the most difficult goals to achieve, for it often necessitates a radical change in the life of the convert.

### The Elements of Persuasion

#### 1. *Reason*

Sibbes realized that an act of persuasion contained many elements, and these receive considerable attention throughout his writings. Perhaps the greatest attention is paid to the element of reason which therefore warrants first consideration.

SOPHISTIC ARGUMENT. In order to understand clearly what Sibbes means by the term *reason*, his distinction between reason and sophistic argument should be noted. Reason Sibbes designates as the most powerful of all elements of persuasion because "God has put [authority] into reason as a beam of himself."[12] Sophistic argument, on the other hand, or the attempt to sustain the doubtful by clever mental gymnastics, weakens the possibility of conversion by making religion a matter of human wit, "the wit of tying and untying knots." The use of sophistic argument may impress an audience momentarily, but it cannot maintain interest. An audience quickly tires of "curious and doubtful disputes," and when confusion sets in, interest is lost. Audiences resent a speaker who attempts to argue them into acceptance. In all this misuse of reason, religion suffers, says Sibbes, offering the example that "that age of the church which was most fertile in nice questions was most barren in religion."[13]

REASON AND EMOTION. Sibbes believes that the true reasoner, in contrast to the sophistic arguer, does not attempt to persuade by reason alone; he knows that reason has a better chance of acceptance if it works through emotion. Persuasion that has the power to change a man's habits is "more than revealing, offering, and persuasion by reason. . . . The most excellent manner of working is working powerfully in the heart."[14]

REASON AND FAITH. Reason, combined with emotional appeal, may still fall short of persuasion until a third ingredient is added. To achieve the conversion of the hearer, insists Sibbes, reason must work with faith, as well as with emotion. Faith should not "make a man cast away reason, but bring reason under."[15] Sibbes does not recognize any disparity between faith and reason. He believes that the preacher makes the best possible use of reason when he "keeps it under, and lets divine truth sway and bring all in us into captivity to itself."[16] He does not regard the marriage of reason and faith as strange. He reminds his readers that

[12] "The Soul's Conflict," *Works*, I, 145.

[13] Sibbes's remarks on sophistic argument are found in "The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax," *Works*, I, 54.

[14] "Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter IV, Verse 7," *Works*, IV, 379.

[15] "Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 17," *Works*, III, 351.

[16] *Works*, III, 351.

a thing may be the object of both faith and reason. Christians usually accept the immortality of the soul on faith, whereas the pagans before Christ arrived at their acceptance of this same theory by means of reason. Also, there are certain persistent concepts that defy reasoned explanations. Among these are the Immaculate Conception, the joining of two natures in one divine nature (Jesus the Christ), and the trinity of persons in one divine nature. Sibbes believes that, faced with the necessity of explanations and the necessity of persuasion to acceptance of such concepts, reason must bow to faith and in this manner faith becomes the reason of reasons.

Because he is an experienced theoretician and an accomplished practitioner, Sibbes is able to make these two opposites—faith and reason—work together in his homiletic doctrine. Because he realizes the power of reason, he wishes it to serve faith. "The greatest reason is to yield to God, who hath revealed [Christian concepts]."[17] Better to clarify his position and make it tenable, Sibbes resorts to deductive reasoning. The following summarizes Sibbes's logical proof for the working relationship between faith and reason. All things that exist have existed first in God, have they not? Reason exists, and therefore reason must exist in God. But, you admit, certain things cannot be explained by reason—virgin birth, the trinity, etc. Is it not reasonable then that these must be accepted by some other means? Now all Christian doctrine must either be explained by reason or accepted on faith. If it cannot be explained by reason, it must be accepted by faith. Now, since God is perfect, that which exists solely in God is more perfect than that which exists both in God and of itself. Faith exists solely in God and reason exists partly of itself. Therefore, faith must be more perfect than reason. Is not the mark of wisdom to yield to that which is more perfect? Since excellent reasoning is wisdom, it is excellent reasoning to yield to faith. To yield all reasoning to Him who created reasoning is the highest form of reasoning. Is this not what faith does and is not faith therefore the greatest reason?[18]

IMPORTANCE OF REASON. While Sibbes attempts to prevent too great a reliance on reason in the persuasive process, at no time does he suggest that persuasion can be successful without reason. As long as man is the auditor for the persuader, reason cannot be neglected. Man is a reasoning being and he lives in a reasoning society; he is held accountable for his words, actions, thoughts, and passions. Education has awakened his mind and taught him to trust reason. Therefore all men who have been elevated above the animal by education respect reason and are affected by it.[19]

USES OF REASON. Sibbes suggests four important uses of reason in persuasion. Reason bridles the imagination and prevents it from becoming extravagant. Reason gives order to discourse by organizing ideas. Reason stimulates the hearer. Sibbes suggests two ways in which this stimulation might be accomplished—by the colloquy and by a series of rhetorical questions. Question and answer methods both stimulate the audience and reveal hidden facts.[20]

[17] "The Fountain Opened," *Works*, V, 467.

[18] *Works*, V, 467-68.

[19] Sibbes's remarks on the rational course being suitable to the nature of man can be found in "Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 23," *Works*, III, 489.

[20] Sibbes's remarks on the value of questions can be found in "Bowels Opened," *Works*, II, 136.

And, finally, reason clarifies and explains. It can show that "the Bible mysteries are not opposite to reason, but above reason."[21]

SUMMARY. Reason, in Sibbes's analysis, is one of the most powerful elements in persuasion, but in solo performance it fails to achieve audience acceptance. To be effectual it must join with a less dignified partner, emotion, and with its rival, faith. Together this trio is able to achieve the purpose of persuasion.

### 2. *Character*

A second element of persuasion is often called *character* in modern terminology. Sibbes refers to it as demonstration or practice. Ministers must win by demonstration as well as by doctrine, he says.[22] What he means becomes apparent as one examines his discussion of ministerial practice.

MINISTERIAL QUALITIES. The persuasive power of character is seen in the exercise of certain qualities. Sibbes advises the minister to show himself worthy of the trust that the audience is willing to place in him, if he wishes to win their acceptance. He must also display graciousness, for "graciousness carries God's blessing with it."[23] The persuasive force of the minister is strengthened if his past life is known to have been exemplary. He should have a genuine compassion for his audience, which his hearers should recognize. His manner of delivery should be sincere, lively, and capable of communicating the depth of his feelings. "God doth ordinarily convert by the best men that can speak from the heart to the heart."[24] Too, the speaker should display wisdom; he should show himself able to impart a knowledge of grace, and he should have and display confidence. "For when we are confident from spiritual experience, it is wonderful how we shall be instruments of God to gain others."[25]

SELF-PERSUASION. In addition to these qualities, persuasion is enhanced if the minister is able to attain self-persuasion at the moment of audience persuasion. "If we would kindle others we must be warmed ourselves; if we would make others weep, we must weep ourselves."[26] Sibbes believes that the sincerity of the persuader should be so genuine that he affects his own life, as well as the lives of his auditors, during the communication process.

CHARACTER AND EMOTION. A further clarification of Sibbes's theory of ethical persuasion may be obtained from his remarks on the relationship between ethical persuasion and emotional appeal. "The holy things that are delivered are, as it were, acted to the life. Men are wondrously affected when they see gracious things delivered with life and feeling. It hath a wondrous lively working."[27] "Two irons, if they be both hot, do close together presently, but unless both be hot, they do not join together handsomely. So that that makes us join together strongly is, if two spirits meet, and both be warm."[28] Sibbes here implies that the character of the speaker is more persuasive when the speaker has a natural warmth and expresses himself with feeling. It might be said

[21] "The Fountain Opened," *Works*, V, 467.

[22] Sibbes's discussion of this point can be found in "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 12," *Works*, III, 260.

[23] "Christ is Best," *Works*, I, 343.

[24] An illuminating discussion on the degree to which conversion depends upon the power of the ministry can be found in Sibbes's "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter IV, Verse 7," *Works*, IV, 387.

[25] "Bowels Opened," *Works*, II, 167.

[26] *Works*, II, 167.

[27] "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 15," *Works*, III, 329.

[28] "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 4," *Works*, III, 71.

that ethical persuasion is nourished by the warmth of emotion.

CHARACTER A STARTER. This is not to say, however, that Sibbes wishes to make ethical persuasion dependent upon emotional persuasion. On the contrary, he believes that character is not dependent upon any other persuasive appeal, but, rather, that the other persuasive appeals stem from character. "We say of physicians, when the patient hath a good conceit of him, the cure is half wrought. So the doctrine is half persuaded when there is a good conceit of the speaker."[29] Character, then, like yeast, is an excellent starter, although it is not adequate by itself to produce the finished product.

CHARACTER AND PERSONALITY. One expects a Puritan to warn his readers against overdependence on the character of the preacher, and Sibbes fulfills this expectation. He states that such overdependence may easily develop into personality worship. Character alone, at best, is only "shallow persuasion. . . . Men that think themselves converted by some excellent part of a rare man, it is usually a shallow repentance."[30]

SUMMARY. Character then, like reason, the other element of persuasion thus far discussed, should not be used exclusively. However, unlike reason, which must be used in conjunction with other persuasive appeals, character does not depend upon any other appeal, but is the starter for the persuasive process.

### 3. *The Emotions*

DUAL MAN. Before we discuss the role that Sibbes assigns to the affections or emotions in persuasion, his concept of the dual man must be explained. For Sibbes, as for many Puritans, man had a dual nature: the carnal and the spiritual. With the carnal or animal nature little could be accomplished. "Not even Christ himself can work upon" this man.[31] The passions of the carnal nature "disturb the very frame of nature . . . and like curious clocks, a little thing will hinder the motion."[32] This carnal nature of man is not the object of the minister's persuasion. Man "in the state of grace" is the direct concern of the minister's persuasion. This is the man "something above nature; God has set his stamp upon him as something special."[33] This nature of man responds to the minister's exhortations and comforts. But why does this man need saving? Is he not already saved? Sibbes answers that the spiritual nature of man has allowed itself to be ruled by the carnal nature. The object of preaching, then, is to awaken the spiritual nature of man so that it may free itself from domination by the carnal nature.

DOCTRINE OF JOY. Sibbes's theory of the use of emotions in persuasion is developed in what one might term his Doctrine of Joy, for to him the ultimate end of the ministry is to help the hearers "forward their joy" here and in the hereafter. To this end the communion and the ordinances of salvation are directed. To those who would insist that instruction is the object of preaching, Sibbes answers that all teaching, exhortation, and reproof is for no other purpose than comfort or joy. "The end of the ministry is . . . to help forward their joy."[34]

MINISTERS CANNOT BRING JOY. Yet a minister of and by himself cannot accomplish this objective. If he could, he

[29] "Bowels Opened," *Works*, II, 167.

[30] "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter IV, Verse 7," *Works*, IV, 387.

[31] *Works*, IV, 384.

[32] "The Soul's Conflict," *Works*, I, 252.

[33] Further discussion of the dual nature of man can be found in Sibbes's "The Saint's Hiding-Place in the Evil Day," *Works*, I, 413-415.

[34] "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 24," *Works*, III, 506.

would be very much like a sorcerer dealing in magic potions. No, says Sibbes, "we can speak the word, but God must speak to the heart at the same time."[35] Sibbes finds that "when there is one Spirit in the teacher, and in the hearers, and in the word, there are wonders wrought of conversion and comfort."[36] The situation is analogous to water utilized as a solution. Water does not cure; by itself it is devoid of medicinal properties. But, when water contains a strong curative compound, it accomplishes wonders. So it is with the word and the Spirit. The spoken word may be the water of life, "the aqua vitae," but Spirit is the dew of Heaven, "the rosa solis." It is the divine influence and vigor of the spoken word that "refreshes and quenches" the soul.[37]

MAN IN A JOYOUS STATE. Why does Sibbes give so much importance to joy or comfort? In his own words, "As there be divers flowers that open and shut with the sun, so the soul, by the Spirit of God, it opens to comforts."[38] This is so because man is either in a state of joy or is striving to attain this state. If the former, he needs to be alerted lest he lose his joyous state. If he is striving to attain it, then he needs all the help the ministry can provide.

JOY A MOTIVATOR. It is now evident that joy can be a strong motivating factor, and Sibbes so intends it. Men act in a certain manner because thus they receive happiness. "We do all, that we may joy," says Sibbes quoting from Chrysostom. Added to this is the Christian demand to "do all with joy." Therefore, joy can be one of the mainsprings of motivation for the persuader. Men tend to accept a doctrine if they know it will bring happiness to them, and/or they are made to realize that it is a sacred duty.

More concretely, Sibbes explains that some men can be motivated by the joy they feel when they remember the existing ills from which they have escaped, or from which they have been freed. Others can be motivated by the prospect of future joy when they have won release from present ills. Ministers should remember that joy makes a cheerful disposition, that it makes a man active in good, that men endure suffering with greater ease if they have joy to lighten their burden, that joy gives lustre to whatever a man does, and that joy wins the acceptance of others.[39]

Specifically, how are emotional appeals to be used in conversion? According to Sibbes, they are to be used to make the hearer aware of his present backsliding. Then with vigor and vividness the minister should portray man's fallen state, his state of damnation. He should thunder God's wrath, the curse that God has put upon evil. This may not sound like enticement to joy, but it is essential according to Sibbes, for without the emotional arousing, which should be produced by strong preaching, there can be no purgation, and joy only comes by contrast after purgation. One must plow before he sows, so one must exhort before he comforts. John the Baptist came before Christ, and Elias felt the storm before he heard the still small voice, Sibbes reminds his readers.

The emotions of the audience are

[35] *Works*, III, 514.
[36] *Works*, III, 514.
[37] The complete analogy will be found in Sibbes's "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 24," *Works*, III, 514-15.
[38] "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 3," *Works*, III, 50.
[39] Sibbes's complete Doctrine of Joy can be found in "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 24," *Works*, III, 506-18.

aroused, then, for the purpose of purgation, to "empty the soul of all sin and prepossessing thoughts or affection,"[40] and the purpose of purgation is to enable the hearer to reach a state of comfort or joy.

> A physician comes and he giv sharp and bitter purges; saith the patient, I had thought you had come to make me better, and I am sicker now than I was before. But he bids him be content, all this is for your health and strength, and for your joyfulness of spirit after; you will be the better for it. So in confidence of that, he drinks down many a bitter potion. So it is with those that sit under the ministry of God, though it be sharp and severe, and cross their corruptions, yet it is medicinal physic for their souls, and all will end in the health of the soul, in joy afterwards.[41]

Before joy can be secured, however, man must be shown how to escape from his present ills and how to prepare himself for his battles with temptation and suggestion in order that he may conquer and triumph. The minister is advised to paint the picture of God and His mercy and loving kindness as vividly as sin paints its picture of pleasure. He should match up the picture of pleasure and carnal delight with as delectable a picture of God and good.[42]

SUMMARY. In summary, emotional appeals in persuasion are used (1) to make reason more acceptable, (2) to awaken man to his true spiritual nature, (3) to alert man to the dangers of complacency that beset him, (4) to purge man, and (5) to present a vivid and persuasive case for good. The objective of the ministry is to bring joy to the people, but fear, terror, alarm, and such emotions must be utilized for the purpose of purgation in order to make joy possible.

[40] *Works*, III, 512.

[41] "Bowels Opened," *Works*, II, 193.

[42] Sibbes's advice on this point will be found in "The Soul's Conflict," *Works*, I, 229.

### 4. *The Will*

WILLING SUBMISSION. Before concluding this analysis of Sibbes's elements of persuasion, we should discuss the will, which, although it is not one of the speaker's tools, has an important role to play in the Sibbesian doctrine of persuasion. The stubborn, obstinate will, however, is not the will that Sibbes refers to. It is fruitless to attempt to persuade the man whose mind is set against the doctrine of the persuader, against the persuader himself, or against the principle of persuasion. Sibbes claims that the minister may expend much effort on these individuals and achieve little or no persuasion. Yet, according to Sibbes's doctrine, persuasion cannot be accomplished until stubbornness and obstinacy have been eliminated. How can this be done? By submission of the will. Sibbes insists that the minister should never force his will on men, nor attempt to force them to change their will. Force is outlawed by Sibbes; only voluntary submission of the will is recommended.[43]

Voluntary submission is absolutely necessary, for persuasion is a cooperative effort. Sibbes does not conceive of persuasion as one man working on another as a carver shapes wooden images. He conceives of it rather as two people cooperating to make the condition of one more desirable, like the tailor and his customer. The hearer is a participant in his own persuasion; he shares the food he has brought to the common spiritual meal. "Though it be made by God, yet we must bring something to this feast."[44] Sibbes also compares the willing hearer to a stone in

[43] Sibbes's doctrine of willing submission can be found in his "The Ungodly Misery," *Works*, I, 393-94, and in "Of the Providence of God," *Works*, V, 37-38.

[44] "The Marriage Feast between Christ and His Church," *Works*, II, 458-59.

the building process. The builder cannot construct without stones: "You must suffer yourself to be squared, cut, and made fit for the building. You must come to church with the expectation to be fitted."[45]

OVERCOMING BELIEFS. When the hearer is willing to give the minister's arguments a fair hearing, he may discover statements contrary to his established beliefs. He then must make a decision. He must either continue to entertain the new idea or reject it. If the minister can communicate his argument so clearly that it enlightens the understanding of his hearer, the hearer may be inclined toward acceptance. If the minister can completely clarify his arguments, he may secure the auditor's conviction. If he is convinced, the hearer will cleave to his decision, and even defend it. Then entrenched beliefs will be rooted out. The hearer now desires to attain the condition advocated by the preacher.

SUMMARY. The will, then, has an important part to play in persuasion. It cannot be forced, bent, or inclined by the speaker. In fact, the speaker should do little about the will of his auditors. Before the auditors willingly submit to persuasion, he can only try to counsel them to such submission. After submission, the minister and the audience cooperate to make persuasion possible.

## THE METHOD OF PERSUASION

We have now examined the definition and elements of persuasion. The Sibbesian method of persuasion remains to be discussed. Sibbes's method of persuasion can be divided for the purpose of analysis into audience preparation, audience priming, and invention.

AUDIENCE PREPARATION. "Persuasion cannot be accomplished without a preliminary preparation on the part of the hearer."[46] The purpose of this preparation is to establish a frame of mind conducive to persuasion. In this frame of mind the auditors willingly submit to the arguments and persuasions of the speaker. In fact, they will "labor to have large hearts,"[47] that is, to overcome prejudices. First of all, the auditors must come to the sermon with some previous preparation. Sibbes advises his hearers to come to the lecture or sermon, "with a great deal of delight and joy; they must come with an abundance from God."[48] In other words, the audience must come with the anticipation of receiving something.

Next, the auditors must be willing to receive the words of the speaker. Sibbes insists that the work of persuasion is not of the minister alone, but the hearer as well must take an active part in the experience, for "our speaking to others doth no good, till they, by entertaining what we say, speak the same to their own souls."[49] In other words, persuasion operates most effectively when the hearer attends to the words of the speaker and joins him in the struggle to win his own acceptance. How can the auditor do this? Unfortunately, Sibbes is not so explicit as one would wish. He states only a general method. The hearer must be attentive, dissatisfied, and he must engage in self-persuasion; that is, he must adapt the words of the speaker to his own situation.

PRIMING THE AUDIENCE. At this stage in the Sibbesian technique of persuasion, the speaker ascertains whether the proper atmosphere for persuasion has

[45] "Of the Providence of God," *Works*, I, 37.

[46] Sibbes's discussion of this point is in "The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax," *Works*, I, 44.

[47] "The Marriage Feast between Christ and His Church," *Works*, II, 451.

[48] *Works*, II, 450-51.

[49] "The Soul's Conflict," *Works*, I, 198.

been achieved. The attitude most conducive to the reception of ideas is expressed by Sibbes in the metaphor, "A Christian must neither be a dead sea, nor a raging sea."[50] In other words, an attitude, neither of apathy nor of emotional exhilaration, but rather of self-examination must be established. The minister encourages this attitude by focusing the attention of the hearer on his past, especially on the events of the immediate past week and the errors committed during this period. For, says Sibbes, "the appetite is raised by sour things."[51] By this means the hearer is led to empty his mind of preoccupying thoughts and thoughts antagonistic or foreign to the ministerial persuasion. Then the hearer will be inclined to "enter his own soul";[52] that is, he will become introspective. When this is achieved, the minister is directed by Sibbes to alert his auditors to immediate action; he should warn them that delay in acceptance is damaging and that immediate acceptance is their salvation.

AUDIENCE ADAPTATION. Throughout the minister's persuasion the need for careful audience adaptation is pressing. "One man's meat may be another man's bane."[53] The speaker should remember that it is disastrous to persuasion to speak "unseasonable truths or comforts in an ill way," or "to use fiery exhortation on those already cast down."[54] Rousing words may fit many, "but broken spirits need soft and oily words."[55] The minister should learn to adapt his material to his hearers generally and specifically, no matter what stage their preparation for persuasion may have reached.

TONE OF PERSUASION. In all this adaptation what should be the tone of persuasion? Whatever else it may be, it should not be stern, answers Sibbes. The minister must not "tyrannize over people's souls to sting and vex them."[56] On the other hand, "when men are dejected by the law, we must not leave them there, but raise them up again."[57] Yet Sibbes does not advise the minister to indulge the audience. Ambitious men, not Christian pleaders, accommodate themselves to the humors of every man just as "ministers of Satan turn themselves into all shapes to 'make proselytes.' "[58]

If the tone of persuasion is not to be strict or indulgent, it would seem that a moderate tone might be the correct answer. But Sibbes rejects this possibility also. It is not moderation that he wants. He suggests neither moderation nor a golden mean in persuasion, but a judicious mixture of stinging, vexing, comforting, encouraging, rousing, soothing, and delighting.[59]

INVENTION. Evidences of Sibbes's careful and exact use of rhetorical invention greet the reader on almost every page of his sermons; we expect to find his explanation of the uses of invention and we are not disappointed.

MOTIVATION. Sibbes has already given the reader directions on the use of motivation in his Doctrine of Joy. There are a few other directions that should be presented. He suggests that the minister use one or more of the following means of motivation. "Use

50 *Works*, I, 159.
51 "The Marriage Feast between Christ and His Church," *Works*, II, 451.
52 *Works*, II, 451.
53 "The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax," *Works*, I, 54.
54 *Works*, I, 54.
55 *Works*, I, 54.
56 "A Commentary on 2 Corinthians, Chapter I, Verse 24," *Works*, III, 506.
57 "The Fountain Opened," *Works*, V, 509.
58 "The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax," *Works*, I, 54.
59 Sibbes's discussion of moderation can be found in "The Bruised Reed and Smoking Flax," *Works*, I, 55-56.

the example of Christ and draw examples from it." Use the example of the apostles' love. Use the possibility of attainment. (It is possible to have a good and happy life; why not attempt it? "We should labor to grow on still from one degree to another, even as the sun shines more and more to the perfect day. . . . It is a Christian's course to compare ourselves with ourselves daily, and if we find a decay in ourselves to rest not contented until we have it amended.") Use the goal of reward. "What makes a person so dull in good duties? They either know not or forget the reward."[60]

OVERCOMING PASSION. If the minister finds someone in a state of emotional disturbance, Sibbes suggests that the minister question him. Question the cause of the tumult of anyone who may be in a temper, basing advice on the doctrine that "distempers rage in silent darkness and can say nothing for themselves." Sibbes suggests that the minister ask the questions, "Why are you posting to Hell so fast? What have you done? Where will this course end?" of those who are lustful. This is based on Sibbes's psychology that the realization of results will determine the actions.[61]

REINFORCEMENT. For the reinforcement of doctrine, Sibbes suggests the following: (1) The minister may use denial, i.e., he may eliminate by denial all that is not included in the doctrine. (2) He may use "perfection," i.e., discovery of all the perfections in the doctrine and contrast with the imperfections in the contrary. (3) He may use the "way of eminence," i.e., comparison of the doctrine with similar objects, thereby demonstrating how it is to be preferred above all else. (4) He may give a foretaste of it. "A taste of communion is in the communion on earth. We may know what the sight of Christ face to face will be by the sight we have of Christ now in the word and the promises. By a grape we may know what Canaan is, as the spies brought back grapes of Canaan in the desert. Peace in heaven is understood by the sweet peace of conscience here." (5) The minister may employ the topic of the lesser to the greater. "This is the way we come to know the greatness of things. If there is comfort in a little glimpse of heaven now, what will there be in heaven? If there is much contentment in the delights of this world, what will be the delights of our pilgrimage?"[62]

CONCLUSION. These are the "heavenly" Sibbes's words of advice on persuasion. Some of these remarks are very provocative, enough so that they may warrant the reader's further investigation; others are commonplace and have interest primarily for the historian of public address. Sibbes's ideas on the psychology of conversion probe deeply into Puritan thinking in the seventeenth century. Many Puritan practices are brilliantly justified by Sibbes; many of his ideas give insight into the relationship between the Puritan minister and his audience. Sibbes states the philosophy of persuasion, not of all Puritans, but of those mighty minds who sought to formulate a practical and attractive religion.

[60] Sibbes's remarks on motivation can be found in "The Christian's Work," *Works*, V, 10-11.

[61] Further discussion of the method of questioning can be found in "The Soul's Conflict," *Works*, I, 144-46.

[62] Sibbes's discussion of reinforcement can be found in "A Glance of Heaven," *Works*, IV, 165-68.

# THE INFLUENCE OF STYLE OF MODERATION ON THE OUTCOMES OF DISCUSSION

William E. Utterback

STUDENTS of discussion method hold conflicting views regarding the role that may most advantageously be assigned to the moderator.[1] Some recommend that he contribute to the substance of the discussion, expressing his own opinion freely and exerting his influence in support of what he considers a sound solution of the problem under consideration; others insist that he remain strictly impartial. And those who favor the latter alternative differ regarding the extent to which he should inject himself into the discussion. Some would restrict him to an occasional remark intended to create an atmosphere of good will or to regulate participation so that all have an equal opportunity to speak. Others suggest that he participate actively in the group's thinking, assisting it to analyze its problem, keeping its discussion relevant, clarifying issues and arguments, and summarizing the conclusions reached. In this view he performs a complex professional service for the group, though without attempting, overtly or covertly, to determine its conclusion. It is with the two latter conceptions, hereafter referred to as "partial" and "full" moderation, that we are here concerned.

The purpose of this study was to subject the styles of moderation to an experimental test of their influence on two outcomes of discussion: (a) the amount of shift in opinion effected by discussion and (b) the amount of progress made toward consensus.

## Method

*Experimental discussion groups.* The 220 subjects used in the experiment were drawn during a three-year period from students enrolled in an elementary course in discussion method. As experimental discussions were held during the third or fourth week of each term, all subjects had about the same knowledge of and experience in discussion. All were acquainted as classmates with the other members of their experimental groups, but no group had met previously for discussion of any topic. All discussions were moderated by the same person. The subjects had no previous acquaintance with him, but he was represented to them as an experienced moderator.

Each of the 55 experimental groups was composed of four subjects from the same section of the course. In making up the groups an attempt was made to equate them with reference to pre-discussion opinion on the proposal to be discussed by avoiding those whose expressed attitude was "undecided,"

*William E. Utterback (Ph.D., Cornell, 1937) is Professor of Speech, Vice Chairman of the Department of Speech, and Director of the Public Address Area of the Department at The Ohio State University.* *This study was supported in part by funds granted to The Ohio State University for aid in fundamental research by the Research Foundation of Ohio State University.*

[1] Here and elsewhere in this paper the terms *moderator* and *moderation* are preferred to *leader* and *leadership* because of the implication the latter terms carry in much of the literature on the subject that the person responsible for facilitating the group's thinking may, or should, attempt to determine its conclusion.

"completely favorable," or "completely unfavorable" and by including in each group two who were favorable and two who were unfavorable to the proposal.[2] As some subjects shifted in opinion during the 24-hour period usually elapsing between initial registration of opinion and the beginning of discussion, only 34 of the groups were actually so equated. All discussions were held in a special room with the moderator seated at the head of the table and with those favorable and those opposed to the proposal seated on opposite sides.

*Problems discussed.* Two proposals were discussed, one dealing with a practical problem in policy presented to the board of directors of a chain drug store, the other with the question whether two college students should marry now or postpone marriage until completion of their college work. In each case the facts surrounding the problem were stated in several paragraphs on a mimeographed sheet of paper. The question for discussion, stated as a single-issue question answerable by Yes or No, appeared below the statement of the problem.

Each problem was distributed to all students in the course on the day preceding that on which experimental discussions were to be held. The students were asked to read the problem carefully but to do no other reading on it, to indicate their opinion on the problem by checking a nine-point rating scale at the bottom of the page, to return the sheet at the beginning of the next class hour, and not to discuss the problem with anyone until after the experimental discussions had been completed. On the basis of the checked rating scales groups of four each were formed, and the experimental discussions followed either immediately or on the next day.

*Measurement of dependent variables.* At the beginning and at the close of an experimental discussion, each subject independently indicated his opinion on the proposal presented for consideration by checking one or another of the nine points on a rating scale ranging from a "completely confident No" through "Undecided" to a "completely confident Yes." For the purpose of scoring, the points on the scale were numbered 1 to 9, beginning at the "No" end of the scale. A shift of one or more units on the scale was regarded as a shift in opinion. To determine whether the group had made progress toward consensus, the subjects' mean distances apart on the scale were computed before and after discussion, and the two means were compared. If the second mean was equal to or greater than the first, it was assumed that no progress toward consensus had been made.

*Moderation.* In all discussions the moderator was instructed to open the discussion by stating the question for consideration and then to conduct discussion until a majority of the group agreed that further discussion would be futile or until 35 minutes had elapsed. In the discussions hereafter referred to as conducted under "partial" moderation, he performed no other function except that of regulating participation so that all members had an equal opportunity to speak. In the discussions hereafter referred to as conducted under "full" moderation, he performed in addition the following functions as he saw need for them: keeping discussion focused on the matter in hand, making suggestions regard-

[2] A previous study had indicated that the confidence with which pre-discussion opinion is held and the existence of a majority in the group influence the subject's readiness to shift in opinion. William E. Utterback, "Independent Variables in the Conference Situation," *QJS*, XL (1954), 381-87.

ing analysis of the problem and the agenda to be followed, clarifying discussion when it fell into confusion, and supplying transitional and summary remarks.

*Validation of the stimuli.* As a check on whether the leader did in fact refrain from revealing his own opinion on the problem discussed, each subject at the close of the discussion was asked to indicate on a ballot whether he thought he could guess what the moderator's opinion was; if he thought he could, he indicated what that opinion was. Of the 212 subjects who responded to the question, 119 (56.1%) said they could not guess the moderator's opinion. The proportions of subjects willing to guess did not differ significantly for the two problems discussed ($.50<P<.70$) or for the two styles of moderation ($.30<P<.50$). On the business problem the moderator as a matter of fact had no opinion. On the other problem, where his opinion was No, of the 35 who guessed, 14 were right, 21 were wrong. This does not differ significantly from chance frequencies ($.30<P<.50$). Seventy-nine of the subjects guessed at the moderator's opinion in situations where the group had reached a majority opinion. Of these guesses, 69 ascribed to the moderator the opinion held by the majority, 10 that held by the minority, the difference between the proportions being highly significant ($P<.01$).

As a check on whether the moderator followed instructions to employ partial moderation in some discussions and full moderation in others, two independent observers, ignorant of the purpose of the experiment, observed the moderator in each discussion and counted the number of times they thought he performed one or another of the four non-regulatory functions enumerated above. The mean number of times he was thought to perform these functions was 1.96 under partial moderation (with a range of 0 to 6) and 24.22 under full moderation (with a range of 11 to 52). Evidently the two styles of moderation did differ in the frequency with which the moderator performed functions other than that of regulating participation.

## Results

*Shift in opinion.* Of the 55 groups only 34 were satisfactorily equated with reference to pre-discussion spread of opinion on the nine-point scale. As the data suggest ($.20<P<.30$) that more subjects may have shifted in the unequated groups, the computation of Chi Square to test the significance of the differences among the proportions shifting is based on the equated groups only. It yields the following results:

On both problems considered together more shift may have occurred under full moderation ($.20<P<.30$). While on the marriage problem alone the difference, in favor of partial moderation, is not significant ($.90<P<.95$), on the business problem alone more shift occurred under full moderation ($.01<P<.02$). Considering both styles of moderation together, more shift occurred on the business problem than on the marriage problem ($P<.01$). This was true also under full moderation alone ($P<.01$) but not under partial moderation alone ($.50<P<.70$). Apparently we may conclude that full moderation was more favorable than partial to shift of opinion on the business problem but that on the marriage problem the two styles of moderation did not differ significantly in this respect.

*Progress toward consensus.* While failure to equate all of the 55 groups

with respect to pre-discussion mean distance apart on the nine-point scale resulted in some groups starting discussion with higher consensus scores than others, the mean of such pre-discussion scores under full and partial moderation (2.94 and 2.81 respectively) did not differ significantly ($t=.194$; $.80<P<.90$), nor did the proportion of equated and unequated groups making progress toward consensus differ significantly ($\chi^2 = 0$). Computation of Chi Square to determine the significance of the difference in the proportion of groups making and those not making progress toward consensus is therefore based on all 55 groups. It yields the following results:

Disregarding the distinction between the two styles of moderation, there was no difference between the two problems in respect to the proportion of groups making progress toward consensus ($\chi^2 = 0$). Disregarding the distinction between the two problems, the proportion of groups making progress toward consensus was higher under full than under partial moderation ($.02<P<.05$). We conclude that regardless of the problem discussed, full moderation was more favorable than partial moderation to achieving consensus.

## Summary

Over a three-year period 220 subjects were drawn from an undergraduate course in discussion method and divided into groups of four each, all groups being provided with the same experienced moderator. Each group discussed for a period of time not in excess of 35 minutes one or the other of two proposals, one dealing with a business situation, the other with a marriage problem. In some groups the moderator employed partial moderation, in the others full moderation. Full moderation was more favorable to opinion shift than partial moderation on the business problem, though not on the marriage problem. On both problems full moderation was more favorable than partial to progress toward consensus.

* * *

# THE BRITISH ORATORS, III

# WINSTON CHURCHILL: ORATOR-HISTORIAN

Charles W. Lomas

ON October 12, 1943, Winston Churchill rose in the House of Commons to make a statement about the agreement just concluded with Portugal for the use of the Azores as a naval base in the anti-submarine campaign. His description of the event in his war memoirs recalls the sensation his remarks created as well as the deliberate intent of the speaker.

> "I have an announcement," I said, "to make to the House arising out of the treaty signed between this country and Portugal in the year 1373 between his Majesty King Edward III and King Ferdinand and Queen Eleanor of Portugal." I spoke in a level voice, and made a pause to allow the House to take in the date, 1373. As this soaked in, there was something like a gasp. I do not suppose any such continuity of relations between two Powers has ever been, or will ever be, set forth in the ordinary day-to-day work of British diplomacy.[1]

This was perhaps Churchill's most dramatic use of history in his wartime speeches, but it was typical of many others. When he spoke to the American Congress, he recalled the common tradition of the English-speaking peoples and found a symbol of that tradition in his own American ancestry, traced through his mother to a lieutenant in George Washington's army.[2] He saw conflict between Germany and France, not only in terms of Hitler's rise to power in the thirties, but also in the shadow cast by the "mailed fist" and "shining armor" of Bismarck and Kaiser Wilhelm.[3] He invoked by inference the proud tradition of British imperial ministers—Chatham, Palmerston, and Disraeli—when he told a wartime audience, "I have not become the King's First Minister to preside at the liquidation of the British Empire."[4]

The frequency of such statements in Churchill's speeches suggested the present inquiry. What were the sources of Churchill's historical interest? How often did he use historical references in his speeches? What was the nature of those references? What purpose did they serve? And finally, in what way did Churchill's awareness of the rhetorical values of history influence his writing of history?

It is a matter of common knowledge that Churchill's school record at Ascot, Brighton, and Harrow was singularly undistinguished. He sturdily resisted learning Latin and Greek, established a reputation as the most caned pupil in each school, and narrowly escaped expulsion on several occasions for academic failure and infractions of school discipline. Nevertheless, at Harrow Churchill formed strong attachments for several instructors who were to have a lasting influence on his life. From Mr. Somervell he learned to write fluent and lucid English. Because he was kept in the Third Form for scholastic

*Charles W. Lomas (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1940) is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of California at Los Angeles. His article, "Churchill's Concept of His Audiences," appeared in the Spring 1958 issue of* Western Speech.

[1] Winston S. Churchill, *Closing the Ring* (Boston, 1951), p. 165. Except where otherwise noted, subsequent references are to books by Churchill.

[2] *The Grand Alliance* (Boston, 1950), p. 671.

[3] *The Gathering Storm* (Boston, 1948), p. 5.

[4] Speech at the Mansion House, November 10, 1942. *The End of the Beginning* (Boston, 1943), p. 268.

deficiencies, he later declared that he learned three times as much English as his fellow students, who went on to Latin and Greek. From C. H. P. Mayo he learned mathematics and a lasting respect for science.[5] From L. W. Moriarty, who headed the Army class, he acquired the taste for history which remained with him throughout his life.[6]

Clearly Churchill's early version of history was not of the pedantic or even scholarly kind. Much of his association with Moriarty consisted of informal evenings in the instructor's home, or of extra-curricular fencing at the gymnasium. In this atmosphere, Churchill learned much history in conversation, not as a collection of facts, but as a panorama of related events, the developing story of civilization. Because his instructor had a military background and interest, the emphasis was on British military glory, the significance of geography, and the tradition of the British empire, all of which Churchill was to use brilliantly in later years.

During his period at Sandhurst Royal Military College, Churchill again studied military history. Off duty, he dug in the remains of Julius Caesar's British encampment. In class, he encountered his redoubtable military ancestor, the first Duke of Marlborough, for whom he formed a lasting attachment. His subsequent research in preparation of a biography of the Duke broadened his knowledge of a formative period of British history and encouraged him in further study of the story of British growth and power.[7]

As Churchill entered public life and began to associate with the great figures of his father's generation, his conviction of the importance of history was strengthened. Some of the parliamentary giants whom, as a boy, he had heard in debate with his father were gone, but others still remained. Listening to speeches by Lord Roseberry, he "felt in living contact with the centuries which are gone, and perceived the long continuity of our island tale."[8] He was impressed in the same way by John Morley, and by childhood memories of William E. Gladstone. Most of all, he came to admire the thorough knowledge and rugged independence of his father Lord Randolph Churchill, whose spectacular career had been cut short when Winston was only twenty years old. In his speeches, wrote the son, Lord Randolph "revealed a range of thought, an authority of manner, and a wealth of knowledge, which neither friends nor foes attempted to dispute."[9] Yet the "knowledge" which Winston Churchill most admired was not of contemporary facts only. Late in his career, he told an American audience, "Knowledge of the past is the only foundation from which to peer into and try to measure the future. Expert knowledge, however indispensable, is no substitution for a generous and comprehending outlook upon the human story, with all its sadness and with all its unquenchable hope."[10]

The substitution of the term "human story" for "history" was more than a rhetorical device. It represented the mature Churchill's concept of history, and determined the character of historical references in his speeches. It

[5] *A Roving Commission: My Early Life* (New York, 1930), pp. 16-17, 25.

[6] Robert L. Taylor, *Winston Churchill: An Informal Study of Greatness* (Garden City, N. Y., 1952), pp. 69-70.

[7] *Marlborough: His Life and Times* (New York, 1933-1938).

[8] *Great Contemporaries* (New York, 1937), p. 6.

[9] *Maxims and Reflections*, compiled from Churchill's works by Colin Coote (London, 1948), p. 62.

[10] Speech at Miami, February 26, 1946, *Sinews of Peace* (Boston, 1949), p. 92.

also influenced his writing of history. In both roles he sought to find parallels between the present and the past, and to fit his more than forty years' experience in statecraft into the pattern of human experience.

The extent to which Churchill made use of history in his speaking may be illustrated by analysis of twenty-two speeches delivered in the first nine months after he assumed office as Prime Minister, and collected with earlier addresses under the title, *Blood, Sweat, and Tears*. In this group are speeches varying in length from less than half a page to more than twelve pages. They were delivered to audiences of every type, including the House of Commons, a Conservative party caucus, and radio audiences in France, Italy, Great Britain, the Dominions, and the United States. They vary in purpose from the strictly informative to the inspirational and persuasive.

Within approximately 125 pages of text, Churchill used 150 references which might properly be classed as historical.[11] Of these references 57 were specific, including 23 to events of the twentieth century up to the outbreak of the war in 1939 and 34 to events occurring before 1900.[12] In addition to these specific citations, there were 41 general historical statements or references to tradition. The remaining examples included 28 statements analyzing the historical significance of contemporary events, and 24 venturing predictions about the course of future history. In general, then, Churchill in 98 cases sought to apply the lessons of the past to the problems of the present, in 28 cases to fit the experience of the present into the unbroken chain of history, and in 24 cases to predict the course of future events.

Both specific and general historical references in the speeches served one of two purposes: to prove a point by a historical parallel, or to provide inspiration to his listeners. Thus the hardships of the battle of France could be minimized by a favorable comparison of casualties with a similar period of time during the German offensive in the spring of 1918;[13] or Hitler's problems in planning the invasion of England might be likened to those of Napoleon;[14] or Nazi atrocities might be magnified by asserting that they were much worse than the "hideous and brutal" acts committed during the Thirty Years' War.[15] In a more general way, he cited the "dogged endurance" of the British Army, "of which there have been so many examples in the past,"[16] or scolded the Japanese for ingratitude for "great services . . . rendered to them by the peoples of the United States and Great Britain since their rise in the nineteenth century."[17]

To provide inspiration for his listeners Churchill often cited specific legendary and historical examples, such as the Knights of the Round Table,[18] the Crusaders,[19] Sir Francis Drake,[20] and

[11] Including explanatory material these speeches are found on pages 273-462 of *Blood, Sweat, and Tears* (New York, 1941). The tabulation is admittedly subjective, but seems accurate enough for the present purpose. The references were not evenly spaced. One speech of eight and a half pages contained only one historical comment; whereas in others, four or five references followed in close succession.

[12] There were, of course, many references to events occurring during the war, but these were counted only if Churchill placed them in historical perspective.

[13] Notes 13 through 33 all refer to speeches in *Blood, Sweat and Tears*, and will be identified by page only; p. 294.

[14] Pp. 295, 296.

[15] P. 344.

[16] P. 279.

[17] P. 390.

[18] P. 293.

[19] P. 293.

[20] P. 368.

Lord Nelson.[21] More frequently, however, he used broad general appeals to British tradition as the basis for his most inspirational passages. He appealed to his hearers to preserve "all that the British Empire has stood for."[22] He praised the heroes of Dunkirk in words that evoked memories of Tennyson's "Charge of the Light Brigade," declaring, "They have added another page to the glories of the light divisions."[23] Reacting to the signing of the Three-Power Pact among Germany, Italy, and Japan, he linked Britain and America when he rumbled, "Neither of the branches of the English-speaking race is accustomed to react to threats of violence by submission."[24] In the presence of the strong emotions of a nation besieged, these were potent appeals.

But perhaps Churchill's feeling for the "human story" was best illustrated by his eloquent use of a historical framework for contemporary events, and in his insistence that the course of history would be altered by those events. Thus he spoke of Hitler's "monstrous tyranny, never surpassed in the dark, lamentable catalogue of human crime."[25] He warned against considering Dunkirk a victory, for "wars are not won by evacuations."[26] He cautioned against Parliamentary investigations in the midst of the war, suggesting that "if we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future."[27] He found grim humor in the fact that a future Gibbon would not need so long a work to write the "story of the decline and fall of the Italian Empire."[28] And he called upon his countrymen to "so bear ourselves that, if the British Empire and its Commonwealth last for a thousand years, men will still say, 'This was their finest hour.' "[29]

In other moments of high eloquence Churchill ventured upon positive, but idealized predictions for the future. "The genius of France will rise again," he said in the dark days of June 1940.[30] And when De Gaulle and his Free French had been condemned by the Vichy government, he asserted, "the day will come, as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow, when their names will be held in honor, and their names will be graven in stone in the streets and villages of a France restored in a liberated Europe to its full freedom and its ancient fame."[31] Responding to a request for a statement of war aims, he declared, "The right to guide the course of world history is the noblest prize of victory."[32] And who can forget his stirring declaration of the temper of the British people under Nazi bombings? Hitler, he broadcast to the world, has kindled "a fire in British hearts, here and all over the world, which will glow long after all traces of the conflagration he has caused in London have been removed. He has lighted a fire which will burn with a steady and consuming flame until the last vestiges of Nazi tyranny have been burnt out of Europe, and until the Old World—and the New—can join hands to rebuild the temples of man's freedom and man's honor, upon foundations which will not soon or easily be overthrown."[33]

It is evident, then, that Churchill in

[21] Pp. 346, 368.
[22] P. 276.
[23] P. 290.
[24] P. 390.
[25] P. 276.
[26] P. 292.
[27] P. 306.
[28] P. 457.
[29] P. 314.
[30] P. 301.
[31] P. 349.
[32] P. 350.
[33] P. 369.

his speeches made frequent and effective use of history. He often cited historical examples to establish the truth of an assertion or to serve as an inspiration to his listeners. He used historical settings to interpret the significance of present events. And he ventured upon predictions as to the ultimate outcome of history. In all of these references, he sought "a generous and comprehending outlook upon the human story."

But just as Churchill's oratory was constantly influenced by his sense of history, it may be equally true to say that Churchill as a historian was constantly influenced by his sense of rhetoric. His method of composition throughout his life has been oral dictation,[34] and all of his writing has shown a sensitivity to the sounds as well as to the meanings of words. Similarly, his selection and arrangement of materials has often been rhetorical. Churchill saw the historian as the interpreter of the past to the present, rather than a mere collector of facts. This view is, of course, shared by many excellent historians. But Churchill went even farther. He believed that the writer of history, like the orator, ought to sift the mass of irrelevant data, select a central theme on the basis of his analysis, and then support that thesis with all the devices of logic and rhetoric at his disposal. In this extension of the interpreter's role, Churchill has often become the advocate, or even the preacher, rather than the scholar.

Churchill's method may be illustrated by his biography of his illustrious ancestor, the Duke of Marlborough. Irritated by what he regarded as false interpretations of history in Macaulay's account of the Duke, Churchill set out to restore Marlborough's tarnished reputation. Herbert Leslie Stewart has written a penetrating analysis of the conflict between two masters of the rhetorical art.

> Often indeed the indignant critic has scored, marshalling examples of graceful imagery or mordant satire which disguise exaggeration or perversion of fact. Augustine Birrell said of Macaulay that he had adopted a style of writing in which it was impossible to tell the truth. . . . But Sir Winston in his refutation is as fairly chargeable with such theoretical faults as Macaulay in the indictment he aims to refute. Diverting indeed is the spectacle of arraignment and defence of Marlborough set forth with so closely similar devices of narrative, of metaphor, of sarcasm, of sportive ridicule and righteous indignation. But the austere requirements of history are forgotten by both alike.[35]

In spite of these shortcomings, however, Churchill has presented in his *Marlborough* a vivid picture of the period of the Glorious Revolution. History came to life in his writing, and the reader cannot be indifferent to the Duke or to the stirring times in which he lived.

In a similar way, Churchill's current historical work, *The History of the English-Speaking Peoples*, is less a narrative of historical events than it is a grand oration on the role of the Anglo-Saxon "race" in world history. Churchill appears to be the orator, the moralist expanding on a theme, rather than the scholar seeking precise accuracy of fact. Especially in the early period, he finds truth not in ascertaining whether a given event occurred as tradition reports it, but in the eternal values the story illustrates.

In the *History* he scorns the caution of historical pedants. He ridicules the carefully qualified statement of one such professional historian that the legend of King Arthur may possibly

[34] *A Roving Commission*, p. 21.

[35] Herbert L. Stewart, *Sir Winston Churchill as Writer and Speaker* (London, 1954), pp. 65-66.

have some foundation in fact. With Churchillian impatience, he sweeps it all aside in a passionate defense of chivalry.

> It is all true, or it ought to be; and more and better besides. And wherever men are fighting against barbarism, tyranny, and massacre, for freedom, law, and honour, let them remember that the fame of their deeds, even though they themselves be exterminated, may perhaps be celebrated as long as the world rolls round. Let us then declare that King Arthur and his noble knights, guarding the Sacred Flame of Christianity and the theme of a world order, sustained by valour, physical strength, and good horses and armour, slaughtered innumerable hosts of foul barbarians and set decent folk an example for all time.[36]

Tongue in cheek, perhaps, but this is not an isolated example, for Churchill in his statement of purpose is also frankly the preacher.

> Every nation or group of nations has its own tale to tell. Knowledge of the trials and struggles is necessary to all who would comprehend the problems, perils, challenges, and opportunities which confront us today. . . . It is in the hope that contemplation of the trials and tribulations of our forefathers may not only fortify the English-speaking peoples of today, but also play some small part in uniting the whole world, that I present this account.[37]

Churchill's attitude toward legend and fact may rightly be regarded as somewhat uncritical, but it should not be inferred that he deliberately distorted facts. The story of King Arthur was a moral parable, and as such it had for Churchill a truth which transcended mere factual accuracy. Moreover his bias was clearly stated, and the reader placed on guard. Certainly no one was deceived by this passage or by others like it.

A more serious criticism is that in some of his contemporary historical writing, Churchill has allowed personal bias to color the facts. David Lloyd George, who knew Churchill as well as any of his contemporaries, stated the charge as vigorously as Churchill himself might have done:

> Mr. Churchill's morbid detestation of the Revolution that in 1919 baffled his most ingenious military dispositions in Russia had rendered him incapable of weighing fairly the causes that led to the downfall of autocracy. The Revolution was the inevitable consequence of the failure of Czardom and not its cause.[38]

Churchill's account of the Russian revolution was indeed incomplete and prejudiced. In extenuation it might be said that his "detestation" was not without cause, and that his low estimate of the moral quality of the Bolshevist leadership has been shared by others not so disposed to ignore the evils of the old Russian autocracy. But it would be more to the point to recognize Churchill's account of the Bolshevist revolution for what it was—a departure from his usual method of writing contemporary history. In his more typical pattern, his vigorous advocacy of a point of view was tempered by a remarkably complete and objective statement of facts and opinions which might be used to support a contrary position.

For the most part, Churchill was highly sensitive to factual accuracy in his account of what he has called the "Second Thirty Years' War." Drawing upon his own vast experience, and backed by a wealth of documentary evidence, he set forth in detail even facts which were adverse to his own point of view. A typical example is his treatment of the disastrous Dardanelles expedition during the first World War, for which he had had primary responsibility.[39] Although he denied the validity of

[36] *A History of The English-Speaking Peoples* (London, 1956), I, 47.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. xvii.
[38] David Lloyd George, *War Memoirs* (Boston, 1934), III, 483.
[39] *The World Crisis, 1915* (London, 1923), pp. 340-344.

arguments which had been urged against the plan, he stated them fully. Similarly, even as he was attacking the policies of Baldwin and Chamberlain in the thirties, he recognized and explained the plausible reasoning which had caused them to act as they did.[40] In each case, on the basis of the facts presented, the reader may come to an opposite conclusion if he is able to escape the Churchillian persuasiveness.

Such escape is not easy, however, for Churchill was never content with being a mere chronicler. In his six-volume work, *The Second World War,* for example, he entered the pulpit with his usual gusto, and declared his intention to "lay the lessons of the past before the future."[41] He announced the "moral of the work": "In War: Resolution; In Defeat: Defiance; In Victory: Magnanimity; In Peace: Good Will." The "theme" of *The Gathering Storm* was stated: "How the English-speaking peoples through their unwisdom, carelessness, and good nature allowed the wicked to rearm." In *Their Finest Hour* he told "How the British people held the fort ALONE till those who hitherto had been half blind were half ready." *The Grand Alliance* reported "How the British fought on with Hardship their Garment until Soviet Russia and the United States were drawn into the Great Conflict." The themes of volumes four and five were factual, but in the final volume, *Triumph and Tragedy,* Churchill was again the preacher: "How the Great Democracies Triumphed, and so Were able to Resume the Follies Which had so Nearly Cost Them Their Life." The increasing use of capital letters suggests the crescendo of the peroration, while Churchill's final irony leaves no doubt of his persuasive purpose. These themes cannot be set aside as mere rhetorical bluster, for the judgments of the historian were backed by abundant evidence. Conflicting views were set forth and analyzed, but the reader is swept along by Churchill's argument and finds it difficult to escape his conclusions.

Churchill's writing of history was thus essentially rhetorical in the full sense of the word. He was almost always the preacher or the advocate rather than the chronicler or the scientific analyst, but he seldom failed to support his position with a mass of relevant facts. In the humanistic tradition of the nineteenth century, his histories resembled in some ways the moralizing of Plutarch, or the method by which Thucydides used the Greek orators to idealize history. Pericles' funeral oration as Thucydides presented it no doubt resembled what was actually said on the occasion. But its real significance for the historian's purpose lay in the way in which it pointed up and magnified the ideals which should have prevailed in democratic Athens. Just so Churchill used history to point up and magnify the traits which he believed were important in the life of modern nations. In the process, objectivity occasionally suffered.

But to the critic of public address, the merits of Churchill's adoption of the rhetorical method for the writing of history would seem to outweigh the disadvantages. He created histories of absorbing interest, which will be read and reread by millions who would not open the covers of books motivated by less vigorous advocacy. With critical

[40] *The Gathering Storm,* pp. 216-217; 221-222, and elsewhere throughout the book.

[41] *Ibid.,* p. iv. The "moral" and the "themes" appear on unnumbered pages preceding the tables of contents in each volume.

readers, Churchill's writing will serve as a challenge to read works by those supporting different points of view, many of which were stated and explained by Churchill himself. His determination to "lay the lessons of the past before the future" will certainly result in thoughtful appraisal of historical precedents for generations to come.

It is also apparent that Churchill's motivation was basically the same, whether he was the historian writing speeches or the orator writing history. "His mission was to preserve the ancient tradition of Britain and the English-speaking peoples." In either case he marshalled impressive evidence in support of his purpose, and sought to stimulate his listeners or readers to sustain that tradition in word and deed. The net result of Churchill's writing and speaking can hardly fail to be a better understanding of the "human story, with all its sadness and with all its unquenchable hope."

* * *

# JOHN MORLEY: CRITIC OF PUBLIC ADDRESS

Dwain E. Moore

JOHN MORLEY, who was born in 1838 and died in 1923, found time in those eighty-five years to carve out careers in two fields. He is well-known as a man of letters: he edited the *Fortnightly Review* for seventeen years; he was editor of the *Pall Mall Gazette* and *Macmillan's Magazine;* he edited the English Men of Letters series; and he wrote some twenty-five volumes of biography and criticism. He is equally well-known as a political figure: from 1883 to 1908 he was a member of the House of Commons and served in Liberal cabinets as Secretary for Ireland and Secretary for India; in 1908 he became Viscount Morley of Blackburn and continued in the House of Lords and in the cabinet until he retired from public life in 1914. During many of his years he was among the most popular of Liberal orators.

Although widely known as a politician and man of letters, Morley is not so well-known as a critic of public address. Professor Wichelns[1] and Professors Thonssen and Baird[2] have glanced at some of his evaluations, particularly in his three-volume *Gladstone* and his two-volume *Cobden*. But Morley's two separate volumes on Burke, and his biographies of Cromwell and Walpole, added to the others, furnish a large body of observations and judgments on speakers and their speaking which has not been analyzed. Apart from his comments on specific speakers, there are materials concerning the nature and function of public address in general which emerge in part from the biographies and in part from his four-volume *Critical Miscellanies* and his *Recollections*. Other works, such as those on Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, and his *On Compromise* and *Biographical Studies*, furnish additional statements. Morley's opinions about speaking in general may derive from his classical education, his wide practice in oratory, and his contemplation. They may have issued from his close observation of speakers in action. Assembled together, they establish his concept of the nature and standards of public address. We shall not now, however, consider his concept of rhetoric. Rather, we shall look for brief answers to these two questions: What aspects of public address most interest John Morley? and, What are his methods as a critic?

The first question may be answered in this way: The evidence from his critical remarks indicates that Morley was interested in virtually every aspect of speaking which interests contemporary critics. He presents careful analyses of the personalities and characters of speakers and of the audiences they faced. He details their leading ideas and arguments. He notes the mode of arrangement and expression. He touches briefly on preparation, and he com-

*Mr. Moore (Ph.D., Illinois, '55) is Assistant Professor of Speech at the Sacramento State College, California.*

[1] Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York, 1925), pp. 181-216; reprinted in *The Rhetorical Idiom*, ed. Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca, N. Y., 1958), pp. 5-42.

[2] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism* (New York, 1948), pp. 263-268.

ments on delivery without considering details of gesture and voice. He invariably records the effect produced, both immediate and subsequent. It appears, however, that Morley's special skill is delineating human character and filling in background detail. Thus his remarks on the speaker's character and personality and on the audience emerge as memorable elements in his criticism. A third aspect, style, Morley thought about deeply and extensively. These three aspects in his criticism help to reveal what he thought important in public address.

Throughout his biographies, we find Morley underscoring again and again the vital impact of individuality—on the audience, on the selection of materials, on their arrangement and expression, on delivery, and on the effects produced. He finds that personality is the key to the difference between speech and literature, declaring that "in the speech the personality of the orator before our eyes gives of itself that oneness and continuity of communication, which the writer has to seek in the orderly sequence and array of marshalled sentence and well-sustained period."[3] That Morley considers personality important we can see clearly in the detail of a chapter called "Cobden as an Agitator"[4] and one in the *Gladstone* called simply "Characteristics."[5] The final chapter in *Burke* is less detailed, but only a little less revealing. These three works and the other biographies contain many scattered observations about the subjects' personalities. In each, Morley reveals his subject's character more in his public performance as a speaker than in his decision and action. Some of the comments on Gladstone's character provide good examples. Morley reports that "of playfulness his speeches give a thousand proofs";[6] that in imagination the Prime Minister "rose to few conspicuous flights";[7] that he possessed a "native capacity for righteous anger," which he controlled by achieving self-mastery over the years.[8] Morley declares that the orator had a lofty point of view which was counterbalanced with being always "amply founded in facts." His speaking "seized vast popular audiences, because it was the expression of a glowing heart and a powerful brain."[9]

In his general comments on public address, Morley stresses further the impact of *ethos*. He believes, for example, that "right expression is a part of character."[10] He lists personality, temper, and argument as the three factors which he was sure create a "lasting impression" and a "real moulding of opinion." These gave Gladstone long spells of power and practical authority.[11] He once asked a friend if he had heard this evaluation of a political speech: "Success depends on three things: who says it, what he says, and how he says it; and of these, what he says is the least important."[12] As a practical politician, Morley seems to agree with the conclusion that character and reputation spell success.

The audience as an aspect of public address is also of paramount importance to John Morley. From the *Gladstone*

[3] John Morley, *Critical Miscellanies*, in *The Works of Lord Morley in Fifteen Volumes* (Edition de Luxe; London, 1921), VI, 17.

[4] John Morley, *The Life of Richard Cobden* (London, 1881), I, 191-208.

[5] John Morley, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone* (London and New York, 1903), I, 184-218.

[6] *Ibid.*, I, 188-189.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Ibid.*, I, 189.

[9] *Ibid.*, II, 123.

[10] John Morley, *Studies in Literature* (London, 1907), p. 223.

[11] Morley, *Gladstone*, III, 534.

[12] John Morley, *Recollections*, in *Works*, II, 225-226.

alone, dozens of instances could be drawn of his careful analysis of the members of an audience and their attitudes toward the speaker and the issues. One example must serve. The occasion was Gladstone's introduction of the Irish Bill in the House of Commons. Morley was himself present. His account follows:

> Nor was public interest at all equally divided. Irish land had devoured an immense amount of time in late years . . .; and to many of the warmest friends of Irish self-government, any special consideration for the owners of Irish land was bitterly unpalatable. Expectation was centred upon the plan for general government. . . . The parliament was new. Many of its members had fought a hard battle for their seats, and trusted they were safe in the haven for half a dozen good years to come. Those who were moved by professional ambition, those whose object was social advancement, those who thought only of upright public service, the keen party men, the men who aspired to office, the men with a past and the men who looked for a future, all alike found themselves adrift on dark and troubled waters.[13]

This, and many other examples through his volumes, indicates that Morley considers an account of the speech setting incomplete which neglects the significant role of the audience in communication, since his analyses reveal careful study of listener attitudes.

Style receives Morley's attention, both in his comments on individual speakers and in his general remarks. He discusses, for instance, Gladstone's skillful use of qualifiers, his copiousness, his over-precision at times, his choice of expression neither plain nor simple, his lengthy sentences. He finds Cobden's address "simple, reasonable, devoid of striking figures of speech, but bright, eager, and expansive . . . quite free from commonplaces."[14] For each of the speakers he studied, he shows an interest in arrangement and expression.

Moreover, his general comments on expression reveal an interesting, modern, almost behavioristic concept. As we have already remarked, Morley considers right expression a part of character. Its foundation is sincerity. The deep desire to use the accurate word impels the speaker to "right expression." In *Voltaire* he reminds us that "style after all . . . can never be anything but the reflex of ideas and habits of mind."[15] Style, he adds, "comes of brooding over ideas, not over words."[16] Morley, then, does not analyze style in detail as choice of words or syntax, nor does he consider details of arrangement; both are the products of character and are treated in broad strokes only. For him, substance and form are closely allied, if not completely indistinguishable.

In general, however, he desires a natural, free, and spontaneous expression based upon the close observation of facts, not a style derived from a scholarly study of the classics.[17] From political speakers in particular, he warns us to expect few passages of fame and grandeur, for the statesman who dominates a crisis is not thinking of producing literary masterpieces. "The great political speech . . .," he declares, "is not made by passages for elegant extract or anthologies, but by personality, movement, climax, spectacle, and the action of the time."[18]

Our second question is, What are Morley's methods as a critic? For an answer we shall look at the context and manner of his criticism and his judiciousness as a critic. First, to understand

[13] Morley, *Gladstone*, III, 310-311. For further examples, see also II, 203-204 and 587-588; and *Cobden*, I, 277-278.

[14] Morley, *Cobden*, II, 477-478.

[15] John Morley, *Voltaire*, in *Works*, VII, 100.

[16] John Morley, "George Eliot's Novels," *Macmillan's Magazine*, XIV (August 1866), 279.

[17] Morley, *Cobden*, I, 111-112.

[18] Morley, *Gladstone*, II, 589-590.

Morley's critical manner we must recall that he was primarily a political biographer rather than a professional critic. Yet many political biographers hold no interest for students of public address, and Morley does. The reason appears to be that in examining the causes of historical transactions, Morley stresses the role of speechmaking. The subjects of his biographies were all men of public affairs. A biographer might, and often does, present such a life as a chronicle of events, merely, with his subject's reaction to them. Morley conceives his subjects expressing their views on events current in the democratic way—of speaking in public in an endeavor to change votes, or at least to procure a fair representation for all viewpoints. He seems to feel that the life of a public man may best be revealed in what he said and did as a public speaker. Such components as "speeches, debates, Bills, divisions, and manoeuvres of party,"[19] all requiring speech, take the center of the stage in Morley's biographies. He analyzes the personalities of his subjects, their impact, their ideas, *as speakers*. The march of history, for him, occurs on the platform and in Parliament.

Nevertheless, happenings which cannot be reported as speeches (such as family background, birth, education, travels, journals, conversation, writings, and so on) are interposed between accounts of speaking, so that rhetorical commentary is scattered and unsystematic when we consider his work as a whole. Remarks on public speaking are often found imbedded in the historical and narrative context. Usually, however, the narrative leads up to succeeding speech occasions—debates in Parliament or campaign speeches on the hustings. In reporting such a speaking event, Morley typically includes all or nearly all of the following elements: (1) the background of events and action leading to the speech occasion; (2) the present status of the issues, to the audience and the speaker; (3) the immediate and background regard of the audience toward the speaker; (4) the speaker's preparation and his physical and mental state; (5) the speech itself considered in all of its elements; (6) the immediate and sequential effects of the speech on the audience, the speaker, and the events of history.[20]

Morley does not organize his materials in the manner of a Goodrich or a Jebb. In his chapters on the general characteristics of his orators, his manner is discursive rather than closely ordered. The most orderly is the chapter on Burke, where Morley's topics touch on Burke as an orator, as a writer, as a stylist, and as a literary influence. His generalizations on public address are also sprinkled throughout his volumes. They appear to spring to Morley's mind at the prompting of remarks about a specific speech or speaker. For instance, in the midst of a full discussion of Gladstone's first budget speech, Morley turns aside to observe that "in politics the spectacle of sheer courage is often quite as good in its influence and effect as the best of logic."[21] Similar observations would make an extensive list. Again, in his *Recollections* and in the critical articles there are many comments on rhetoric surrounded by other materials. Once more, general remarks are suggested from the context of particulars and are usually incidental to the principal matter of the

[19] John Morley, "Disraeli," *Living Age*, CCLXVII (December 10, 1910), 644.

[20] See, e.g., *Gladstone*, I, 103-104; III, 310-312; *Cobden*, I, 271-279; and *Burke*, in *Works*, XIV, 126-130.

[21] Morley, *Gladstone*, I, 171.

entry or essay. The point is that Morley does not marshal his materials into forms which now seem to identify the rhetorical critic.

In general, we may conclude that the extent of Morley's work, the scattering of his comments on speech throughout their bulk, and his failure to employ professional rhetorical terms (perhaps principally because their use would appear esoteric in political biography) all have helped to build a barrier which has contributed to denying him wider currency as a rhetorical critic.

On the other hand, his method helps to make him skillful in coining and presenting a swift general characterization of public speaking. One instance will demonstrate his skill. The passage is a classic brief summary of a debate extending for sixteen nights on the Irish land bill:

> Several . . . showed themselves masters of the higher arts of parliamentary discussion. One or two transient spurts of fire in the encounters of orange and green, served to reveal the intensity of the glow behind the closed doors of the furnace. But the general temper was good. The rule against irritating language was hardly ever broken. Swords crossed according to the strict rules of combat. The tone was rational and argumentative. There was plenty of strong, close, and acute reasoning; there was some learning, a considerable acquaintance both with historic and contemporary, foreign and domestic fact, and when fact and reasoning broke down, their place was abundantly filled by eloquent prophecy of disaster on one side, or blessing on the other. Neither prophecy was demonstrable; both could be made plausible.[22]

In detailing Morley's methods as a critic, we should comment briefly on his judiciousness. He is a careful workman who exercises caution and prudence in his evaluations. Although many of his characterizations appear quite broad, we find that he typically adds detailed analysis to support the original conclusion. He works as often as possible with original texts and sources, pursuing a fine line between what he viewed as two alternatives in biography: "Is a book to be literature, or is it to be an exact record, amply replenished with Hansard's chapter and verse?"[23] He uses the private papers of an orator, and appropriate comments from members of the audience qualified to report accurately on the elements of speaking. To research on these lines, he adds his own wide experience. In an essay on Lecky he remarks, "You may judge a speech, or an Act of Parliament, or a piece of policy, at your own fireside, but you will never from that distance know enough of the tone of a legislature to warrant very confident assertions about it."[24] Finally, his style displays a careful choice of words in an easy narrative flow, marred only, upon occasion, by purple passages.

John Morley emerges as a critic interested in every aspect of speaking, but particularly skilled in analyzing the personality of the speaker and the make-up of an audience and in revealing the nature of arrangement and expression. Although his methods as a critic have hidden his skill from most of us, his historical - biographical - critical method produces interesting, careful, and valuable comment on public address of the nineteenth century.

[22] Morley, *Gladstone*, III, 313.

[23] Morley, "Disraeli," p. 644.

[24] John Morley, *Critical Miscellanies* (London, 1888-1913), IV, 196.

# NOTES TOWARD A THEORY OF DICTION

Anthony Ostroff

AS a teacher of interpretation, I have become increasingly aware of a need for a general theory of diction. The importance of the study of diction to the study of poetry is obvious, for the poem begins with the word. Yet the study of the individual word and the processes by which it accomplishes particular meanings is usually neglected in the teaching of poetry. At least, it seems rarely to be approached in a systematic way when it is approached at all.

The problem is the absence of a theory of diction which is both comprehensive and functional, one capable of serving the teacher as well as the philosopher; in short, a *practical* theory—one which can explain the words with which the literary work begins, in terms readily accessible to us all. The notes which follow by no means supply such a theory, but I hope they may suggest the outline of one, as well as certain specifics which may be of value in themselves.

A general theory of diction should explain in some detail three things: a) the nature and function of denotation; b) the nature and function of connotation; c) the nature and function of context as a control on meaning. Provision of such a theory would go a long way toward insuring both that the student of poetry develop a general sensitivity to the total possibility of meaning in words and that he develop responsibility to specificity of meaning in particular contexts.

*Mr. Ostroff is Assistant Professor of Speech at the University of California at Berkeley. He is a teacher of literature, criticism, and interpretation and is himself a poet.*

A.

The development of such a theory might begin with the observation that language exists by agreement. We are, in a sense, all parties to a contract binding us to certain principles or conditions regarding the structure of language and the meanings of words. The nature of the agreement is simple with respect to denotation: for expediency of communication we agree to an arbitrary set of symbols standing for certain things, properties of things, concepts, relationships, etc. We agree, for example, that the word *black* shall stand for a certain color. Thus it becomes possible to talk about "black" or "blackness." And we attempt more or less carefully to draw up, or codify, our agreement on denotation. We provide ourselves with dictionaries in which our agreements as to the denotations of words are described or "defined."

We must keep in mind, however, as the semanticists have been at continual pains to remind us, that our definitions succeed only by being able to direct us to experiences of the actual things or concepts for which they stand. For example, if "blackness" is defined as an absence of light, and if we understand the words "absence" and "light," we can refer ourselves to past experience of blackness and know what is meant; or, if we have not had the experience of blackness, we know how to set about trying to have it—actually or imagina-

tively. The important thing to be remarked about all this is that we shall understand "black" or "blackness" only in terms of our actual experience of phenomena (including the phenomenon of thought itself), and for our agreement on the denotation of "black" or "blackness" to be meaningful, we must have experienced that for which we agree to have the words stand. This last is true, obviously, of both denotation and connotation.

Although the study and explanation of denotation present problems which have absorbed philosophers for centuries, and continue to provoke great activity in our own time, the problem of explaining denotation in a practical theory of diction may be relatively simple. In any case, denotation is not the great source of difficulty in teaching the kind of language sensitivity necessary to reading poetry successfully. Denotative meaning may be explained, for literary purposes, along the lines here suggested, and easily enough understood. But connotation is another matter.

B.

The significant difference between denotation and connotation is in the nature of our agreement upon meaning with regard to the two. In both we must have agreement on a common experience or body of experience to which we are referred by the word. But in denotation our agreement is conscious and wilful. That is, we know we are accepting meanings (for words) to which our society has more or less formally agreed. In connotation, however, our agreement on meaning is usually simply assumed, rather than consciously or wilfully made; certainly it is not often enough a formal agreement to result in dictionaries.

Thus when Burns says his love is like a red red rose, which will make sense only on a connotative level, he is not relying on any formal agreement by which we have equated a certain connotative meaning with "red red rose." Rather, he is relying on our experience, either actual or potential, of redness, roseness, and red roses, as being sufficiently consistent with his so that we can make out his point—i.e., think and feel what he wishes us to think and feel as a result of his statement. He *assumes* an area of agreement with us on certain experiences of meaning and attitude related to the image of a red rose.

We might say we *pledge* our agreement in the case of denotation; we *assume* it in the case of connotation. We are obliged to be relatively precise in our agreement on denotation, for it is largely through denotation that we use language to conduct the necessary practical affairs of life; but there is no comparable practical demand to force us to the same kind of attention to our agreement with respect to connotation. Clearly, where our agreement on meaning is conscious and, so to speak, formal or official, we shall not have nearly the difficulty with meaning we shall have where agreement is subconscious and informal.

We notice, for example, that the student remains fairly conscious of his experience of denotation. But his experience of connotation tends to fall largely into the subconscious, from which, often, it may not easily be restored to consciousness. Where he "forgets" his experience, or knowledge, of denotation, he may have recourse to the dictionary—as he may if his need be to acquire new experience and knowledge of denotation. But for such of his experience or knowledge of connotation as he has forgotten, there is no convenient plan of recovery; and where he

needs to learn a new connotation, there is no ready source or method from which he can construct the experience he requires.

The practical problem, then, in the study of diction, is largely the problem of connotation, and it is to this that I wish to direct major attention.

Let us say the connotation of a word is composed of all meanings and attitudes associated with the word other than those directly denoted by it in any given context. If we cannot "look up" connotations of words in some such convenient place as a dictionary or encyclopaedia, we must have some method of tracing them so that we can write our own descriptions or definitions—but descriptions or definitions which will be accurate with reference to a general area we may reasonably assume of public agreement on language: i.e., experience common to us all. An accurate description or classification of the sources of those associations from which connotation derives would provide such a method.

As a beginning toward such a classification I should like to suggest four major sources of connotation: 1) the usual social contexts of the word itself; 2) the non-contextual denotations of the word; 3) the usual "objective setting" in which that which is denoted by the word exists; 4) attributes and qualities of that which is denoted by the word. These categories, which provide classifications not of *kinds* of connotation but of *sources* of connotation, are useful in providing questions which may be put to words in order to determine the substance of that on which agreement may be assumed for connotative meaning—i.e., in order to discover what range of possible and probable connotative meaning may exist with reference to specific words.

1.

In designating the first category, "usual social contexts of the word," I use the word "social" in its broadest sense, so as to include all written as well as all oral communication — which means that social context will include historical context. When we ask of a word, "What are its usual social contexts?" we ask when, where, and by whom it is generally used. If we have particular answers to these questions for a given word which are different from the answers we get applying the questions to most words, we have discovered certain concepts, substances, or areas of experience which may operate as connotations of the word.

For example, in Frost's poem, "Come In," we encounter the word "Hark." (The first few lines are: "As I came to the edge of the wood/ Thrush music —hark! / Now if it was dusk outside/ Inside it was dark.") The student is likely to gloss the word as meaning "listen" and respond no further; or, he may be vaguely troubled by its archaic note and wonder why it is used instead of "listen," which denotes exactly the same thing. If he is an especially apt student, he may observe that both words, as commands to pay attention to something which is to be heard, create a sense of expectation, perhaps suspense, in the reader or hearer of them. But he will probably be able to explore no further.

If, however, he should try to examine the words "hark" and "listen" with reference to their usual social contexts, he will find himself becoming aware that they are quite different in the backgrounds they suggest. "Listen" is used by everyone; it is peculiar to no particular situation (other than the general one of attention I have already remarked) and to no particular period of

history. Most of us are probably aware of the word "hark," however, through two sources—religious songs and writings (particularly Christmas carols and the Bible), and fairy tales. We recall "Hark the Herald Angels Sing" and the princess in the tower crying, "Hark, the dragon!" or "Hark, I hear the good knight galloping." With his attention properly directed, the student is likely to discover these two general areas of his society's experience of the word and to be able to take from them senses of romance, magic, mystery, and awe, which may function as connotations of the word. And indeed, in the poem when he later finds "Far in the pillared dark/ Thrush music went"—with the cathedral sense of the forest provided by "pillared dark"—the hush of mystery which has appeared as a possible connotation of "hark" is confirmed.[1]

Other examples might be suggested. Such a word as "meson" which denotes a median-mass particle of matter somewhere between the mass of the proton and the electron, as a very new word in nuclear physics, might have to many of us overtones of modernity, with suggestions of the extreme complexity of matter, the mystery of energy, of the universe itself; of the romance of the more esoteric reaches of modern science, the wonders and terrors of the atomic age. To one who knows Greek, it may have still other associations. The word "apple" has, as one familiar social context, the context of the story of Adam and Eve in the garden, and may take from that a variety of connotations. And so on.

The three levels of usage sometimes remarked in discussion of diction—formal, informal, and vulgar—fall into this first category of usual social contexts. Normally, we will talk of formal language rather than formal diction, but it is apparent that certain vocabularies are more or less peculiar to each of these general levels of language, and that for words identifiable as usually belonging to one or another of these levels, we have sets of connotations emerging from such identification; that is to say, we have associated meanings and attitudes proceeding from or related to the usual effects we associate with the three levels of usage. The familiar example of the words "sweat" and "perspiration," which have the same denotation but different connotations determined by our senses of the general levels of society in which we usually find them employed, may serve as illustration.

2.

By the second category of sources of connotation (the non-contextual denotations of words) I mean to suggest that those denotations of a word which do not apply in a particular context may function as connotations in that context. Obviously, this category will be of no use in reference to words having only one denotation. But many of our words have multiple denotations, all of which are potentially associated meanings and some of which may be actualized as connotations in specific contexts. For example, in Frost's poem, "The Road Not Taken," in explaining why he took one of the two symbolic roads facing him, Frost says, "Because it was grassy and wanted wear." We know the word "want" has two denotations.

[1] This is not to evaluate the word as regards its function in the poem but merely to indicate part of its intended function. "Hark" may or may not be a successful usage depending on whether its archaic note too much distracts a reader from the movement of a poem which is otherwise cast in fairly informal and certainly current language. It is perhaps unnecessary to point out that the rhyme with "dark" is, by itself, hardly sufficient justification for the word.

One is "to lack" (which is still, I believe, a fairly common New England usage) and the other, more frequent, is "to desire" or "to wish for."

In the context of the poem (the next lines of which are: "Though as for that the passing there/ Had worn them really about the same") it is clear that the immediate application of the word is its denotation of "lack." But the other denotation hovers close by, and indeed in the context of the poem—where we find the protagonist equivocating between the two roads, unsure really how to explain his choice of one over the other when both were appealing, though finally willing to take the responsibility for the choice he makes—the other meaning of "wanted" seems so consistent with the poem that it, too, comes into play. Frost chooses one road because it "lacks wear"; the fact of the road's being unworn is attractive, invitational to Frost. And of course our sense of that calls into play, on the level of connotation, the meaning of "to wish for," "to desire," in the word "wanted"—so that we have a sense that the road itself invites Frost down it, irrespective of his attitude toward it, itself desiring as well as lacking wear.

Clearly this second category is intended to account for many of those asymmetric ambivalences of meaning we know as puns, and the question it will have the student put to a word is simply "What are all the denotations possible to this word?" In answering the question, he places at his disposal a variety of meanings (and associated attitudes), one or more of which he may find applicable on the level of connotation.

3.

The third category I propose as a general area of sources of associated meaning and attitude of words is the category of "the usual 'objective setting' of that which is denoted by the word." By this I mean the usual scene or situation (in the so-called "real" or objective world) in which whatever object or event or relationship the word denotes is thought of as existing.

For example, the first denotation the dictionary gives us of the word "cannibal" is "a person who eats human flesh." We tend, generally, to think of such persons as members of primitive tribes of the dark-skinned races, located in tropical climates. We perhaps further tend to think of them as located on islands of the Pacific, because of a bulk of romantic literature dealing with cannibals. So when Eliot has Sweeney say to Doris, "I'll carry you off to a cannibal isle," we have, in addition to the suggestion of extreme carnality in "cannibal," a further suggestion of the kind of island—hot, tropical, isolated, perhaps rather small, etc.[2]

Take the word "apple" for another example. By turning our attention to the usual scenes in which we find apples, we make available to ourselves certain fields of experience and potential meaning to which the word "apple" may, connotatively, refer—such as the orchard, the general context of the out-of-doors and growing things, a beneficent nature, etc.

In Lawrence's poem "Green" the word "apple" in the first line, "The dawn was apple green," carries overtones of freshness and coolness in part from the sense of the setting of green apples it may

[2] Of course it is possible to go on to further and more subtle levels of association in the formation of connotation with reference to all the examples I have given so far, as for instance in the one just mentioned, the sense of a relation between heat and carnality, privacy and violence, etc.—but I take such further development of relationships of meaning and attitude to be unnecessary to the outline of theory which is the main purpose here.

stir within us—the early summer orchard in the early morning, with the freshness of its dew, its morning cool and calm, etc. But this particular connotative value of "apple" in this instance takes its strength from other sources as well, and may serve to lead us to the fourth category of sources of connotation.

4.

The fourth category is perhaps the most frequently important and the simplest, and yet it is the most difficult to describe. I have, in despair at finding a more suitable label for it, called it a category of "attributes and qualities of that which is denoted by the word." What I mean to suggest is that all those attributes or qualities, those properties and characteristics of that which a word represents, may themselves be connotations of the word, or may call to mind associated meanings or provoke certain attitudes which may be connotations of the word. For example, the word "tiger" denotes a certain kind of member of the cat family. We may find in it connotations of grace, power, savagery, etc.—grace, power, and savagery all being attributes or characteristics of the tiger. Further, we may respond to these attributes or characteristics with attitudes which may also be connotations of the word. For example, a sense of fear, danger, respect, awe, admiration, etc., may also be connotations of the word "tiger."

So for this fourth category, the questions we ask of the word are: what qualities, properties, and characteristics go to make up that which the word represents; what meanings do we associate with these, and what attitudes do we take toward them? Again, our answers may provide fields of experience, meanings, and attitudes which may be connotations of the word.

Quite clearly a word's connotations may be limited to one or two of the sources of "associated meaning and attitude" I have outlined; and sometimes a word may have connotations deriving from all four sources. In the word "apple," for instance, we find connotations deriving from the first-named source (the usual social contexts of the word—here, an important historical context), none from the second (non-contextual denotations—for apple may be considered a one-denotation word at present), important connotations from the third source (the usual objective settings of that which is denoted by the word—e.g., the orchard), and also connotations from the fourth source (attributes and qualities of that which is denoted by the word). The latter would stem from certain qualities of apples—the firmness of their flesh, the sweet tang of their taste, the freshness of taste and texture, and so on. For "apple" as used in the Lawrence poem mentioned we shall have connotations of freshness, coolness (it is dawn, and the apple will be cool), a certain piquancy—enforcing and enhancing those connotations we got from source three.

It is probably unnecessary to point out that I have considerably oversimplified in the illustrations I have provided. We may think of the story of William Tell and the apple as a "usual social context" of the word "apple," for example, and have more connotative possibilities there; we may think of the fruit bins of supermarkets as among the "usual objective settings" of apples themselves, and have more connotative possibilities there; and we may think of the dance, "The Big Apple," or of "road apples," or "dumb apples," as additional denotations, and have some

second source connotations there, etc. It has obviously been impossible to treat in complete detail any of the examples used here. It may have been observed, however, that the limitation of detail in the examples used has been oriented to the relation of the word-examples to certain verbal contexts. I have tried, in the hope of keeping attention focused on the first problem of discovering fields of possibility of meaning relating to connotation, not to discuss the problem of context explicitly; but of course it has been implicit in the treatment of examples, and it is the final matter of great consequence to be considered in formulating a theory of diction.

C.

The first principle of context is, of course, that context is a control on meaning. Essentially, it is a control by limitation of meaning, and the principle by which it operates is fairly simple, although the way in which it operates may be extremely complex. The context of a word in a poem is a certain body of meaning provided by other words, and it limits the meaning of the individual word by requiring that its meaning be consistent with the larger body of meaning, the context, in which it appears. This is most easily illustrated with reference to words of multiple denotation.

Take the word "run," which has an immense number of denotations both as noun and as verb—from those of the animal activity of running, to the potential to operate as when we say "the car runs," to "run" as in "running for an office," or a "run in a stocking," or a "run of luck," or a "running stream," or a "salmon run," etc. Obviously, context tells us which denotation to apply. Let us give the word "run" the context of one more word: John. Assume we know John to be the name of a person. "John runs" then obviously limits us to two or three possibilities. Either we mean John is putting one foot down in front of another at a great rate of speed, or that he is able to do this, or, if we are a little careless of our grammar, that he is running for some kind of office. Addition of another word, "well," will resolve us on a single denotation: we must mean John is especially capable when it comes to the physical activity of moving rapidly on one's feet. Obviously none of the other denotative meanings of the word "runs" is consistent with the meanings of the context (some of which are supplied by our agreements on the structure of language, or grammar).

Context operates as a control on connotation in precisely the same way. In the Lawrence poem "Green," for instance, although overtones of sin, guilt, shame, or overtones of irony, of human business and bustle versus nature, etc., are possible connotations of the word "apple," these obviously cannot apply in the context of the poem.

For another example, let us consider the word "lily," which denotes a kind of flower and may be a proper name. Let us consider its connotations with reference to the first denotation. They will exist around senses of death, for lilies are funeral flowers; around senses of resurrection and spirituality, for the lily is also the flower of Eastertide; around senses of life, freshness, fruition, for lilies are flowers of spring; around further senses of purity and spirituality, for lilies are white and white traditionally symbolizes purity and spirituality; perhaps also, in this Freudian age, around sexuality because of the shape of the lily. (This is to talk very generally of the word's connotative possibilities, but it will serve for the point.)

Now, suppose we have a paragraph about a death, and then lilies are mentioned as "gleaming dimly in the dusky interior of a church." What will be the central connotations? Here they will be ambiguous and contradictory—we may have connotations both of life, resurrection, and of death. Now suppose "the waxen lilies" or "the pallor of lilies in the gloom" is mentioned. Clearly the operative connotations will be those surrounding death as a dead end. Suppose a bombed-out cathedral in which services are being held has just been described. Then lilies are mentioned as ". . . a white shout in the spring sun streaming down from the broken windows."[3] Here, clearly, the operative connotations are those relating to the sense of life, spring, resurrection. If we have a poem about a displaced person, spiritually destroyed and morbid, concluding with these surrealistic lines:

> The ardent lily looks with longing
> On the languid Viennese.
> The vulture perched upon the psalm tree
> Lifts its wings and takes the breeze.

obviously in the "ardent lily" our connotations will proceed from complexes of meaning and attitude surrounding senses of sexuality and deathiness.

Of course context exists and operates on many, many levels of complexity. Generally, the simplest context for any word is one more word. The next simplest is two more words. And so on until we have the extremely complex context of the whole poem, where the symbolic statement of the image may complicate the literal statement, and form may further complicate meaning or tone, and so on with complication after complication. But it is not to the point here to discuss the whole job of reading and fully experiencing poems; it is, rather, to suggest certain important considerations in beginning the process of reading and fully experiencing poems. In this perspective, in dealing with context as one such important consideration, it is valuable to begin with the simplest operation of context, for in its simplest operation is the clearest key to the basic principle by which it operates on whatever level of complexity.

### ADDENDUM

Two additional matters deserve statement before concluding these notes toward a practical theory of diction. First is the matter of form. It has not been considered earlier for two reasons. 1) Because the form or shape of the individual word is to a very large extent a function of meaning (e.g., rhythm, volume, and pitch are all chiefly determined by meaning); the consideration of form as an influence on diction, therefore, necessarily follows on some consideration of meaning. 2) Because the interplay of form and meaning is both so complex and (to me) mysterious that it must require very lengthy discussion if it is to be dealt with at all. There is simply not space here for such consideration.

It may be pointed out, however, that the forms of words (by which I mean their physical shapes, both as sounds and as visual symbols) may supply connotation directly;[4] and that it may indirectly, as a part of context, both supply and control connotation.

At best it seems we can make only rather loose statements regarding the form of individual words. However, useful observations can be made and have been made. The general rule that

[3] Unfortunately, we got such a bad line in a popular novel of a decade ago.

[4] Form perhaps should be listed as a fifth category of sources of connotation.

holds the iamb a heavier foot than the dactyl, for instance, or the trochee effeminate compared to the iamb or spondee, is a valuable one and provides us with a tool for discovering something of "meaning" or "feeling tone" on the connotative level. The observations made regarding the "liquid" or "soft" or "gentle" qualities peculiar to certain consonants—*l, m, n,* (and *r* sometimes)—are valuable in the same connection. Although finally such observations or "rules" lead us only to the ineluctable mystery of musical tone, they are useful in calling attention to that mystery. And if only for that reason, there is need for a better systematization of theory of word-form than presently exists.

The second matter which suggests itself as perhaps an important adjunct to some of what has been proposed here is this: Apropos of the importance of connotation in poetry, and the way it functions, it may be valuable to set down as a principle the fact that it is possible that what is normally a connotation of a word may operate as the "functional" denotation of the word in certain contexts. I mean by "functional denotation" the primary application or force of a word. Very often in poetry, and nearly always somewhere in the figure of speech, we find words used directly for one or another of their connotations, rather than for their normal denotations. For instance, when we say one is "black hearted" the immediate application or first meaning of "black" is "wicked"—which is normally a connotation of the word but which here functions as denotation. The same sort of thing happens when Spender in "The Express," talks of "the black statement of pistons." Here, again, the immediate application of "black" is a reference to some of its normal connotations (such as "dense," "heavy," "strong," "unequivocal") rather than to its normal denotation. The principle involved deserves statement both to explain to the student the impossibility of purely "literal" reading of poems, and to demonstrate the great importance of understanding connotation in a fairly precise and responsible way.

There is no real conclusion to an essay such as this. Notes toward a theory stop short of the full theory. A last word, however, before closing: Lest there be any misunderstanding of the implications of what I have here proposed, let me make clear that I do *not* propose that every time anyone reads a poem he ought to go through the rather mechanistic process I have sketched, trying to figure out all the possible meanings and attitudes the words of a poem might convey and then tediously, word by word, image by image, and so on, subtracting, adding, and dividing, according to the development of context, until finally he gets through the whole poem. One cannot read and enjoy poems for long by such a practice. But by such a practice one can learn two things: first of all, something of what an enormous amount is really *in* a good poem; and second, a kind of awareness of meaning that is imperative to successful reading of poetry. Of course the trained, sensitive reader of poetry will shortcut a great deal of the sort of activity implied by this paper—but he will be able to do so because he has *developed* the kind of knowledge and awareness of language for which the notes and suggestions incorporated here are meant to hold brief.

# THE FORUM

## LINGUISTICS AND LITERARY ANALYSIS

*To the Editor:*

Another attempt by a linguist to demonstrate the importance of linguistic theory and technique to the analysis of literature appeared in the October 1957 issue of *QJS* under the title, "Linguistics, Poetics, and Interpretation: The Phonemic Dimension," by Seymour Chatman. Despite his very reasonable warning in the early part of the article that linguistic techniques must be used sparingly and cautiously as tools of literary criticism, Mr. Chatman goes on to develop the point that some knowledge of "phonemics" on the part of the interpreter is essential to the proper understanding of poetics. He makes his first point in this way: "Segmental sounds occur in patterns and clusters which have aesthetic effects if not readily discernible meanings. And if phonemics has a job in poetics, it is perhaps to furnish the critic with a finer description of these effects and not to go searching for symbolic meanings" (248). After making it clear that "—the quantitative recognition of a feature is barren as an occupation in itself," he suggests that the number of occurrences of a given sound in a particular environment in a poem is significant only when it can be demonstrated that this number is *not* predictable from what we already know about the relative frequency of this sound in other types of texts and in the total speech pattern. As illustrations he cites "murky mildewed monument" and "merry mincing madcap." He points out that the effect of the bilabial nasals is not qualitative—has nothing to do with joy or sorrow—but that "the repetition of *m* intensifies the lexical content of the phrase because the laws of English phonemic probability are normally disinclined to repeat *m* thrice within so short a span" (251). This is certainly true. But it is also certainly trivial, as any native speaker of the English language could have told Mr. Chatman. The native speaker does not have to be told that such repetitions of an initial sound are unusual. If he did, he would not, obviously, be a native speaker. An account of the transitional probabilities of sequences of phonemes is of importance to the linguist—its value to the interpreter of poetry has yet to be demonstrated.

Mr. Chatman next applies the results of a study by Sol Saporta, "Frequency of Consonant Clusters," *Language*, XXXI (1955), pp. 25-31, to an examination of some stylistic features in Keats' "Ode on a Grecian Urn." He cites the following sets of consonant clusters from the Keats poem and remarks that "Surely these heavy clots of consonants all in one stanza are not matters of accident" (252): [štbr], [nsnsl], [nstð], [nǰdl], [ǰnd], [dnzl], [tstr], [glt], [mbrlz]. Now in the first place, although Mr. Saporta disregards syllable boundaries in the tabulation of the frequencies of his clusters, he does not ignore word boundaries: "—the sequence *at last* is not considered to include the cluster [tl]" (27). Mr. Chatman admits such clusters. For example, the first cluster he derives from the phrase: "unravished bride of quietness" [ənrævišt brayd əv kwayitnes]. If he

is going to use Saporta's hypothesis, which he quotes, he must also use his type of data. Before one can suggest that Keats is deliberately striving to slow down the reader by the density of his consonant clusters, he must take into consideration the effects of stress and juncture. In the second place, all of the syllabic nasals and liquids will have to be excluded from the analysis. Once these have been removed, together with the clusters which have been included over word-boundaries, we can examine the remaining four clusters to determine their high or low frequency of occurrence. If they prove to be of low frequency we may say that they tend to retard the movement of the poem, since low-frequency items are those which offer the most difficulty either to speaker or listener. [š] and [t] have a difference of seven units; [n] and [s], five; [s] and [t], four; [j] and [d], five. According to Saporta, clusters differing by 2 (maximum effort for the listener) or by 8 or 9 (maximum effort for the speaker) are avoided; the majority of consonant clusters tend to differ by 4, 5, or 6 units. This would seem to be borne out by the clusters cited by Mr. Chatman. One, [š] and [t] has a difference of 7; the rest all differ by 4 or 5. It seems to me that it would be difficult to defend the thesis that Keats has deliberately created an unusual density of low-frequency consonant clusters in order to achieve a particular poetic effect, since no such density occurs. In order to cite this type of sound combination as a distinctively Keatsian stylistic device of his later poetry, it would be necessary to show that the same types of consonantal clusters do not occur with the same frequency in his earlier poetry, nor in the poetry of other poets, nor in normal speech. This Mr. Chatman has not done.

Even if one were to grant that Mr. Chatman's use of transitional probabilities and frequencies of consonant clusters constitutes something more than a trivial contribution to poetics, it is still difficult to see how they furnish us with a "finer description" of aesthetic effects. They furnish a more accurate description of possible *causes* of aesthetic effects—certainly not of the effects themselves.

Mr. Chatman closes this section of his article with this rather confused statement: "I do not see, however, that anything about segmental phonemics—the study of individual sounds[?]—*except* relative frequencies and transitional probabilities will be of much use. That is to say, except as a problem in *method*, the phonemic principle does not appear particularly relevant to poetics" (252). Now, since the study of transitional probabilities and relative frequencies is marginal to phonemic method, it is difficult to know precisely what is meant by the phrase "except as a problem in *method*."

Chatman's treatment of suprasegmental features leaves much to be desired from a linguistic point of view. He uses the Smith-Trager system without, however, warning his readers that this system, nothwithstanding its great importance to linguistic science in general and the description of English in particular, is subjective, controversial, and especially deficient in its treatment of tone, stress, and juncture (Smith and Trager have not, for example, determined the relation of syllabic length to amplitude in what they consider to be a stress feature).

One is not always quite certain that Mr. Chatman is not in danger of putting the cart before the horse when he

discusses tone, stress, and juncture in terms of a written text. Concerning his example 2), for instance, nothing in the world but the syntax is going to tell us that "Persian" in

> And like a Persian mitre on her head
> She wore, with crowns and owches garnished

is a substantive and not a modifier. Because of the lack of indication of a juncture between "Persian" and "mitre" we would be inclined to read "Persian" as a modifier the first time through. By the time we arrive at the juncture after "wore," however, we discover that there is no complement for the verb. We then have to go back, alter the stress and tone pattern, and put in the right juncture. Of course, tone, stress, and juncture in speech, serve to clarify the syntactic function of grammatical items. It is precisely because we are dealing here with writing where tone and stress are never indicated, and juncture not always consistently, that syntactic analysis must precede suprasegmental feature analysis.

The same may be said of example 4), his treatment of Shelley's, "The sphere-fire above its soft colors wove." But here there are certain inaccuracies in his transcription:

$$\text{The}^{2}\ \text{sphère-fire}\ {}^{3}\textit{abóve}\ \|\ {}^{2}\text{its}\ \text{sòft}\ {}^{3}\text{cólors}^{2}\ |\ {}^{2}\text{wóve}\#$$

Now, although spectrographs will show that compounds of the type "sphere-fire" do occur with level stress, this pattern does not occur for nominal compounds in the Smith-Trager system which records only this / or this /\. Presumably, if one is going to follow the Smith-Trager analysis, his transcription should be consistent with theirs. A rising tone on "above" as indicated by his double bar juncture would be unusual but not impossible; however, since he has already begun the word on a high tone (3), the result of going from 3 to 4 or 5 would be little less than ludicrous. Mr. Chatman notes the choice of considering "above" either as adverb or proposition. The statistical probability of "wove" functioning as an intransitive verb is extremely slight and thus the probability of "above" functioning as preposition equally so. And we had better not call "above" an adverb. It is a modifier which functions ambiguously in this position either as adverbial or adjectival or both.

The lines from Donne, which Mr. Chatman quotes and which he calls ambiguous because of the lack of proper punctuation in most editions, are quite properly punctuated in Hebel and Hudson's *Poetry of the English Renaissance* which was published in 1929:

> Hither with crystal vials, lovers, come
> And take my tears, which are love's wine,
> And try your mistress' tears at home,
> For all are false that taste not just like mine;
> (177)

Their punctuation, with commas before and after "lovers," determines the reading which Mr. Chatman suggests and which, in fact, is the only reading of the line syntactically possible.

Poetry is a particular manifestation of language and as such exhibits certain linguistic facts which are susceptible to scientific investigation and description by the linguist. The extent to which the results of such investigation may with profit be applied to the interpretation of poetry is yet to be determined. Certainly, a knowledge of the suprasegmental feature system of the language is essential to the literary critic if he is to *describe* the poem accurately. But how essential is that knowledge to an intelligent interpretation of the poem? to an intelligent read-

ing of the poem? Mr. Chatman's suggestions have not, I feel, answered these questions.

JOHN C. MCLAUGHLIN
*Department of English*
*Indiana University*

## HAIMAN TO HELLMAN

*To the Editor:*

Hail Hugo Hellman! No flannel-mouthed equivocator, he. No one can accuse him of "thought-in-process." He knows the answers and isn't afraid to use all his skills (such as lifting out of context) to advance his cause. What does it matter if his reader is led to believe that John Keltner regards "keeping everyone happy" as a primary criterion of excellence in discussion? Anyone knows that these group dynamics characters are "way out in left center field."

And what scholarship! Imagine the endless hours, if not days, of research that must have been necessary to dig up a quotation from Jefferson suggesting that our third president believed the people incapable of governing themselves. We can only admire the dexterity involved in stepping around the dozens of other Jeffersonian quotations to the contrary. "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he then be trusted with the government of others?" Or, "The influence over government must be shared among all the people. If every individual . . . participates of the ultimate authority, the government will be safe." Or, "I am persuaded myself that the good sense of the people will always be found to be the best army. They may be led astray for a moment, but will soon correct themselves." Or, "The mass of mankind has not been born with saddles on their backs, nor a favored few booted and spurred, ready to ride them legitimately, by the Grace of God."

But who cares what the political philosophers believed anyway? Where could we find a better description of democracy than Hellman's own statement that "the mass of Americans have expected and have generally been happy to be told what to think, by men they judged qualified to tell them"? Who among us, for example, would be so naive as to question the President's assurances that the world and our nation are secure in a state of peace, prosperity, and progress?

Surely none of us flannel-mouths, anxious to maintain harmony with Mr. Hellman at all costs and to "integrate" his views with ours, will dare question his interpretation of Riesman's *The Lonely Crowd,* to the effect that America is losing its greatness because of our change from inner-direction to other-direction. We will hold our tongues and repress the knowledge that Mr. Riesman condemns both patterns with almost equal ferocity and proposes that our greatness lies in the autonomous man—he who thinks for himself, submits blindly to no authorities, and cooperates with others not from fear of social pressure but on a basis of mutual respect for differences and such common interests as can be discovered. . . . Mr. Hellman, in the future I wish you would stick to writing about the techniques of argumentation.

FRANKLYN S. HAIMAN
*Northwestern University*

## AN EXEMPLARY TAFT LETTER

*To the Editor:*

I recently chanced upon an interesting (and exemplary) letter of William Howard Taft in original typescript in

the Historical Manuscripts Collection of the Yale University Library. Permission has been obtained for its inclusion in The Forum; and the complete text, previously unpublished, follows herewith:

WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT
Cincinnati, Ohio

Augusta, Georgia
January 11, 1909

My dear Jim:

I have your letter of January 8th, in reference to the Yale dinner. My impression is that you would better add to your list of speakers at the dinner, for I don't think I shall take up time enough to warrant anybody coming there to hear me alone, and while I have no doubt of the interesting character of the President's address, I think you ought to enliven the meeting with some really post prandial and suitable oratory. You yourself are given to serious talk, and I fear that the quips and jests which there ought to be at such a meeting will be absent.

Of course, I subscribe to any program you make, but I have considerable sympathy for [page 2] those who are to gather at the board.

And remember that I don't deliver two-hour speeches!

Sincerely yours,
Wm. H. Taft (SIGNATURE)

Mr. James R. Sheffield,
52 William Street,
New York City

The genial wisdom of President Taft's allotting prime consideration here to *the audience*, his own eminence notwithstanding, is surely wisdom worth sharing. Rhetoricians and textbook editors, please note.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.
*Yale University*

## AN AUTHOR OBJECTS

*To the Editor:*

A sociologist trained in the humanities finds occasion for dismay in both fields: on the one hand, there is a tendency among social scientists to be indifferent to our inherited culture; on the other hand, many of the self-appointed guardians of literary culture assume a pose of superior disdain whenever they find a barbaric social scientist nearing their precincts, and the philistines among them cry up philistinism against any new orientation that they will not, or cannot, comprehend.

Criticism has its prerogatives. It may turn thumbs down, as Mr. McCollom did, on my book *Literature and the Image of Man* in *QJS*, December 1957, pp. 436-7. But even the most negative criticism can and should be made in a responsible way. Mr. McCollom has not wounded me, but I am sensitive to cliches, be they those of the humanist or of the social scientist, and the more so when they are used as a substitute for learning. Social scientists stand only to benefit by serious criticism from the humanists, but Mr. McCollom needs more precise erudition in the history of philosophy before serving as a critical bouncer.

He needs, first of all, a glossary of terms, in order to learn the difference between realism and nominalism in late medieval philosophy. The denotation of reality by concepts, which I believe can be traced in many Shakespearean dramas, does not make Shakespeare a "realist" in the medieval sense; on the contrary, this is classical nominalism, which I set in contrast to Lope de Vega's adherence to the reality of universals. Furthermore, it was Mr. McCollom and not I who "dragged in" the term *Gestalt*. My thesis is that the instruction of Don Quixote to Sancho

Panza anticipates the "configuration" of modern idealistic ethics, and to speak of a configuration of categories, their interrelatedness either on the same or on an hierarchical level, is a basic analytical procedure in philosophical theory, particularly in the systems of German idealism from Kant to Hegel, and in the Neo-Kantian and Neo-Hegelian schools of the twentieth century. Instead of indicting my references to epistemology as "window dressing," Mr. McCollom would do well to inform himself on the inseparability of epistemology and ethics in idealistic philosophy.

What basis Mr. McCollom has found in my text for the assumption that I am "a liberal democrat" eludes me, though it is not an unpleasant label to be tagged with. More important, I am at a complete loss as to where he found me making the trivial and unspecific allusion that Cervantes, Shakespeare, and Goethe displayed "a good measure of respect for middle-class attention to business." As to his observation that I interpret "Molière as a happy and even complacent bourgeois," I can only conclude that the books he had before him on his desk must somehow have gotten mixed up. Finally, the list of words singled out as "sociological jargon" has about as much to do with that discipline as Mr. McCollom's piques and snobbisms have to do with the humanities.

LEO LOWENTHAL
*University of California*

## THE REVIEWER EXPLAINS

*To the Editor:*

Concerning the particular points made in Mr. Lowenthal's letter:

1. The third paragraph objects to the following sentences in my review: "He describes Lope de Vega as a more or less medieval realist and Shakespeare, by contrast, as a nominalist. Yet for Shakespeare, 'such names as honor, virtue, fame—although they may temporarily have no phenomena to which they can be related—denote human attributes which can again become part of reality.' Doesn't this make Shakespeare a realist?" See Dagobert Runes (ed.), *A Dictionary of Philosophy*: "Nominalism: (Lat. nominalis, belonging to a name) In scholastic philosophy, the theory that abstract or general terms, or universals, represent no objective real existents, but are mere words or names, mere vocal utterances, *'flatus vocis.'*" But perhaps the author had in mind William of Ockham's nominalism, according to which universals signify a number of particular things at once. (M. H. Carré, *Realists and Nominalists*, p. 107.) If for Shakespeare, however, "virtue" and "honor" denote attributes not now in reality, he treats these words not merely as *universalia in rem* but as *universalia ante rem* with respect to the virtuous and honorable people who will come into existence. For the time being, "virtue" and "honor" denote that which is in the realm of possibility. This would be a strange kind of nominalism.

2. The third paragraph objects to my criticism of the following sentence, which describes a speech by Don Quixote referring to truth, mercy, and "emotionality": "The configuration of these categories constitutes in almost complete form the philosophy of modern idealism—morally as well as epistemologically." I did not deny that epistemology and ethics are inseparable in modern idealistic philosophy. I objected to the technical terms "configuration" and "epistemologically" as used in the quoted sentence. I am unable to see why truth, mercy, and emotionality are a configuration except that Don Quixote

wants judges to be merciful, especially to the poor; just; and unconfused by appeals to emotion. Moreover, there is nothing in the author's discussion (pp. 52-54) to justify the very broad statement in the sentence I have quoted. It makes a quick foray into a highly technical field of thought without clearly contributing to the literary or sociological understanding of Cervantes.

3. Attention to business. As my paragraph on Mr. Lowenthal's discussion of Shakespeare attempted to show, the author wrongly interpreted Shakespeare as holding up for admiration "middle class individualism and industriousness." The chapter on Goethe emphasizes that writer's growing awareness of the claims made by a middle-class, business society.

4. The chapter on Molière represents him as almost completely satisfied with the middle-class ideals of his time. Characteristic statements: "For Molière's people even a noble defeat is out of the question" (p. 125). "We are at the height of middle-class optimism" (p. 134). I believe the chapter is one-sided; but my assertion that Mr. Lowenthal describes Molière as "even complacent" may not be fully justified.

5. The chapter on Knut Hamsun seemed to me a clear indication of the author's democratic liberalism. (I admire that point of view.)

I criticized the book mainly for its style and its interpretation of Shakespeare. Commenting on the Master's order to the Boatswain in *The Tempest*, Mr. Lowenthal writes: "We are quickly introduced to a situation structured by the needs of expedient work under conditions of utmost stress" (p. 222). The sentence illustrates the needlessly technical language in which much of the book is written.

I may have been too stingy with praise. The chapter on Goethe, for example, seemed to me informative and interesting. And I should like to add that the well-known sociologist C. Wright Mills reviewed the book very favorably in *The New York Times* last year.

WILLIAM G. MCCOLLOM
*Western Reserve University*

# NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

ROBERT GUNDERSON, *Editor*

## BIOGRAPHY AND RHETORICAL CRITICISM

Robert D. Clark

A generation ago, in an essay that was to have unparalleled influence on graduate studies in public address, Herbert Wichelns judged the biographical and literary approaches to the study of orators and oratory to be unsatisfactory.[1] The former, he said, was concerned with the orator as man rather than man as orator; and the latter, gowned in judicial robes, asked the futile and irrelevant question, "Is this oratory literature?" Neither, he said, is *rhetorical criticism*, for rhetoric is concerned with effect. Personality and style, the respective provinces of the biographical and literary approaches, are important adjuncts of rhetorical criticism, but only as they relate the speaker and what he says to the audience and the effect he achieves.

James A. Winans had put Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, tempered with modern psychology, back into the undergraduate classroom; Wichelns established it as the canon for graduate seminars and theses. Rhetorical criticism, Wichelns said, is "necessarily analytical," the *topoi* to be drawn from Aristotle. This scarcely meant that the *Rhetoric* was a Procrustean rack on which to stretch the joints or contort the frames, one by one, of the world's roster of orators; nor did it mean that to be "necessarily analytical" (as is evident from Wichelns' splendid essay on Emerson)[2] was the final goal of criticism. But the formula, however subtle in its implications, seemed too patent, too easily accessible to the harrassed Ph.D. candidate. As a result of a new awareness of the ancient canon our graduate schools have spawned a series of Aristotelian commentaries, listings of the *topoi*, the interstices of which are filled up with examples from the orator under study, modern-day *illustrationes*.

Since these studies have been concerned with individual speakers, and since the topics include the speaker's personality, his character, his leading ideas, his audience, they have too often been loosely labeled "biographical." If the introductory section is long enough, and the illustrations of the topics are sufficiently copious, the candidate can avoid the more arduous task of careful reading of the text itself. Small wonder that Donald Bryant should protest that the "tendency to write biog-

*Mr. Clark (Ph.D., Southern California, 1946), Dean of the College of Liberal Arts, University of Oregon, and an Associate Editor of* QJS, *is the author of* The Life of Matthew Simpson *(Macmillan, New York, 1956).*

1 "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," in *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* (New York, 1925), pp. 181-216; reprinted in *The Rhetorical Idiom*, ed. Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca, N. Y., 1958), pp. 5-42.

2 "Ralph Waldo Emerson," in *A History and Criticism of American Public Address*, ed. William Norwood Brigance (New York, 1943), II, 501-525.

raphies of speakers . . . rather than rhetorico-critical studies, must be kept in check, or at least in proportion."[3] Bryant is quick to admit the propriety of studies of individual orators; and he seems to inveigh less against biography than against a biographical obfuscation that is neither biography nor criticism.

The fact is that rhetorical critics have by and large eschewed biography as a form of criticism. Either the weight of Wichelns' condemnation hangs too heavy over us or we have not yet succeeded in getting beyond the analytical tools to the literary synthesis requisite to biography.

There is, however, no denying the force and continued relevance of Wichelns' criticism. Biographers, even in this age of the "new biography," often neglect or spurn oratory. They regard it as a source, a mine of information from which, along with letters and journals, they may extract the speaker's leading ideas on public questions; or less often, as an index or barometer by which they may measure the orator's popularity. A smaller number look upon the oration as a dramatic episode in the life of the speaker, an opportunity to present a vivid portrait of the orator and the *milieu*. Richard Current, for example, in his little volume on Webster, asserts that his chief source is the *Works* (largely orations), "which make surprisingly good reading."[4] But Current exhibits no sense of oratory as a factor in the development of Webster's career or as a tool by which he propagated his National Conservatism. Charles Wiltse, in his three-volume biography of John C. Calhoun,[5] adjudged by a panel of historians as one of the best twenty-five American biographies of the first half of this century,[6] treats the most dramatic orations of Calhoun's career, those on the Force Bill, with scarcely any sense of the drama and with no attention to rhetoric, save for a few sentences on style and delivery and the delightful and illuminating demand from John Randolph, "Take way that hat. I want to see Webster die, muscle by muscle." Benjamin Thomas, in his excellent one-volume biography of Lincoln,[7] employs the speeches as dates on the calendar, events to chronicle the life of his subject, or sources from which to select phrases that reveal his political thinking. The few fragments on Lincoln as the speaker, or on the audience before him, Thomas inserts as bits of color to quicken the interest of the reader rather than to appraise a medium through which Lincoln achieved his eminence or persuaded the people or lent direction to the course of politics.

The failure of given biographers to recognize the importance of rhetoric in the lives of their subjects, does not, however, force the conclusion that biography is an ineffective vehicle for rhetorical criticism. Wichelns had high praise for Morley's *Cobden* and *Gladstone;* and Thonssen and Baird, judging *The Life of John Bright* to be the "best modern example of a biography in which oratory is allowed to function as the determinant of a man's claim to

[3] "Rhetoric: Its Functions and Its Scope," *QJS,* XXXIX (December 1953), 423.

[4] *Daniel Webster and the Rise of National Conservatism* (Boston, 1955), p. 203. It may be argued, of course, that Current was not writing a biography but supporting a thesis.

[5] *John C. Calhoun, Nullifier, 1829-1839* (Indianapolis, 1949), pp. 186-195. In the volume as a whole the author is much aware of the rhetorical problem, as Carroll Arnold points out in his review, *QJS,* XXXVI (1950), 100-101.

[6] John Walton Caughey, "Historians' Choice: Results of a Poll on Recently Published American History and Biography," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review,* XXXIX (1952), 301.

[7] *Abraham Lincoln, A Biography* (New York, 1952).

distinction,"[8] commend Trevelyan for showing "rhetorical critics how letters and speeches, together with the intelligent interweaving of historical narrative and interpretation, can reveal the true stature of an orator." Allan Nevins' account of the Lincoln-Douglas[9] debates is admirable for its portrayal of the debaters as orators struggling for the minds of their audiences as well as for the favorable judgment of the reading public; if it lacks an awareness of the rhetorical topics of structure and style, the omission is not beyond repair.

If Bryant, in insisting that the biographical studies "be kept in check, or at least in proportion,"[10] intends to say that the interest in the speaker must not supplant the interest in the speech, one cannot quarrel with him. We need some tough-willed grubbing at the speeches themselves if we are to understand the persuasive process. The product of such grubbing may quite properly be the thesis or the monograph, not rhetorical criticism. Commentaries on style, or argument, or structure, or symbols and semantics are fragments of a larger whole. Rhetorical criticism, in the more general sense, is a synthesis that takes into account not only the speech but the speaker and the occasion, each broadly and intensively construed. Let there be analysis, the scrutiny of language, the study of the power of words, of the appeal of the figure, of the stratagem of argument, reflection on the psychological whim of an auditor, on the coerciveness of groups, and let all of these be gathered into learned monographs. They are necessary foundations to criticism; they may be significant contributions to understanding and scholarship, and as such may be justified in their own right. Now and then they may be sufficiently well wrought to take their place in the literature of criticism, but for the most part they will best serve as the materials for a larger synthesis, a more complete rhetorical criticism.

What better vehicle for such criticism is there than biography quickened as it may be and ought to be with creative imagination? If it lacks in the systematic treatment of the rhetorical topics, it achieves or should achieve dramatic unity in its portrayal of speaker-audience-speech. Such a biography, indeed, is William Norwood Brigance's *Jeremiah Sullivan Black*,[10] the digressive and somewhat repetitious chapters on law and oratory omitted. And Marie Hochmuth's splendid analysis of Lincoln's *First Inaugural*[11] condensed and the analytical section integrated into the whole (and the self-conscious references to the function of the rhetorical critic deleted), would fit admirably into biography.

Whether or not biography is rhetorical criticism, our graduate students continue and undoubtedly will continue to favor the study of individual orators. We look, therefore, with professional interest at John A. Garraty's recent volume, *The Nature of Biography*.[12] The title is somewhat misleading, for Professor Garraty is concerned, primarily, not with the metaphysical question of *nature* but with the problems and methods of the biographer. The book is a manual for practitioners rather than a philosophical discourse; it is more a compilation of the reflections and ex-

[8] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism: The Development of Standards for Rhetorical Appraisal* (New York, 1948), p. 271.

[9] *The Emergence of Lincoln* (New York, 1951), I, 374-399. One might cite many other able studies, of course.

[10] Philadelphia, 1934.

[11] Wayland Maxfield Parrish and Marie Hochmuth, *American Speeches* (New York, 1954), pp. 21-71.

[12] New York, 1957.

periences of others than reflections on the reading and experiences of the writer.

The title is derived from the initial essay. The other two divisions treat, respectively, the historical development of the biographical form, and the method of the biographer: choosing a subject, the materials of biography, the problem of personality, and composition.

The section on method is valuable not only for the systematic treatment of problems confronting the biographer but perhaps more for the citation of the practices of those who have written biographies. The chapter on "The Problems of Personality" is the best readily available summary of the techniques of the social scientist in measuring personality, or at least of those techniques of measurement that may prove useful to the biographer. Abjuring the practice of psychoanalyzing the dead or of assessing motives intuitively, Professor Garraty recommends content analysis of the writings and cites the techniques of Ralph K. White, John Dollard and O. H. Mowrer, A. L. Baldwin, and others. These approaches are closely akin to those of H. D. Lasswell, P. F. Lazarsfeld, and other students of mass communication in whose studies rhetoricians demonstrate an increasing interest.

In his historical treatment Garraty considers biography in the Ancient World, particularly among the Greeks and Romans, its development as an instrument of the church in the Middle Ages, its growth under the impetus of the Renaissance humanism, the maturing of the biographical form in the eighteenth century, the heavy-tomed life and times of the nineteenth century, and the "new biography" of Lytton Strachey, Andre Maurois, Gamaliel Bradford, their contemporaries and imitators. This rapid survey of the development of biography is both a review and a critical commentary on the most significant works. As a guide and stimulus to further reading it is a useful aid and a profitable investment for any student of biography or history of rhetoric. As a commentary, its brevity (120 pages) makes it less valuable than the more specialized and more selective studies of Harold Nicolson (*The Development of English Biography*)[13] or Donald A. Stauffer (*The Art of Biography in Eighteenth Century England*).[14] The notes at the end of the book, an exhaustive list of sources, provide a useful supplement to the commentary.

One may object to Mr. Garraty's imposition, in this brief history, of modern standards on the biographical product of the earlier centuries. But his reiteration of criteria exhibits his views of the good and bad qualities of biography much more fully than does his subsequent treatment of methodology. The implied counsel is well worth attending to. He praises Plutarch, "the supreme figure of ancient biography," because he emphasized "character over career," because he was "interested in people rather than in history." If Plutarch lacked the modern scholar's concern for tracing information back to its source, if he did not always distinguish between fact and hearsay, was not always impartial, was, in fact, a hero-worshipper, he at least managed to escape from the panegyrical element of the Greek *encomium* and the Roman *laudatio*, he had a marvelous gift for the character-revealing anecdote (as that of Alcibiades and his dog), and his ultimate goal, whether he was treating those whom he admired or those whom he abhorred, was *understanding*.

[13] New York, 1928.
[14] Princeton, 1941.

And so Professor Garraty renders judgment on the chief biographers of the centuries, praising them for shifting the emphasis from "moralizing to narrative," for use of "the loving detail," for "the flair for physical description," for the "concrete illustration in creating vivid images," for the use of a "terse style," for recognizing that "biography should be entertaining in itself," for "ruthless honesty and meticulous scholarship," for the ability to relate a story in "a clear and fascinating manner," for the determination to tell "all the truth so far as the biographer knows it." He condemns the biographer who moralizes, who recognizes "no firm line between truth and fiction," who is so concerned with "the rules of charity" that he fails to tell the whole truth, or so interested in history that he misses the opportunity to bring his subject to life, or so absorbed in facts and dates that his is "coldly impersonal," who is careless with facts or indifferent to interpretation. He cites with approval Edmund Gosse's condemnation of the "biographical morticians" who bury the dead "under the monstrous catafalque of two volumes." He praises Lytton Strachey for "his devilish wit, his mastery of irony and innuendo, his epigrammatic style," his fathering of "a school that made biography interesting and readable," but he upbraids him for his lack of respect for truth, his use of fraudulent sources, his invention of material.

A generation ago Harold Nicolson ended his Hogarth Lectures on a pessimistic note: scientific biography, he said, was hostile to, and in the end would be destructive of, the literary interest. The literary biography would continue but would become more and more remote from the factual foundation; the scientific biography would become more specialized, oriented to sociology, economics, psychology, aesthetics, biology.[15]

Mr. Garraty believes (rightly in the opinion of this reviewer) that biography can achieve a new synthesis, that it may be at the same moment "history in microcosm" and "imaginative and artistic" writing, and that it may, in proper proportion, reconstruct the life and personality of the subject and the times in which he lived. But the *portrayal* of personality, says Mr. Garraty, is more than analysis or understanding; it is, in the words of Allan Nevins, "primarily a literary gift." Or, to cite Nevins in another context, "a great biography is a creation in the symphonic or operatic order, not a lyric."[16]

All of this advice is good, but it is concerned with biography, not with rhetoric. And yet what is more fascinating than to trace the effect of the spoken word in the affairs of men? If the biographer is more interested in the speaker than in the word, and the student of mass communications more concerned with the word than the speaker, why should not the rhetorician attempt to synthesize the science and the drama?

BOOK REVIEWED

THE NATURE OF BIOGRAPHY. By John A. Garraty. New York: Knopf, 1957; pp. xiv+290 +xii. $5.00.

THE LIFE OF SIR JOHN ELIOT. By Harold Hulme. New York: New York University Press, 1957; pp. 423. $6.75.

The name of Sir John Eliot will be familiar to those whose interests include the study of British public address, for it was Eliot whose style of speaking Goodrich likened to that of Demosthenes. And it was Eliot who died a martyr's death in the Tower of London in 1632 as a direct result of his parliamentary orations.

[15] Nicolson, p. 155.

[16] *The Gateway to History* (Boston and New York, 1938), p. 328.

There has long existed a need for a careful, well-documented study of Eliot's life, a need finally fulfilled last year with the publication of the volume noted above. The product of over twenty years of reflection and research, this work is for the most part a thorough and accurate account of the life of a pioneering parliamentarian.

Chapter III, entitled "The Birth of an Orator, January to May, 1624," is of particular interest to students of public address. Unfortunately Professor Hulme's rhetorical analysis of Eliot is cursory indeed. To be sure, frequent quotations from speeches attributed to Eliot appear both here and throughout the book. But the author seems to spend almost as much time analyzing speeches which were never delivered as he does those which contemporaries attest to having heard. Moreover, no effort is made to assess Eliot's speech delivery, his organization of ideas or the adaptation of those ideas to a particular audience, or the probable sources of Eliot's arguments and evidence.

Aside from this limited treatment given to various phases of Eliot's speaking, however, Professor Hulme has made a valuable contribution to our understanding of this important seventeenth-century parliamentary spokesman.

GOODWIN F. BERQUIST
*The Ohio State University*

GEORGE BIRKBECK, PIONEER OF ADULT EDUCATION. By Thomas Kelly. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1957; pp. 380. 45s.

THE MECHANICS' INSTITUTES OF LANCASHIRE AND YORKSHIRE BEFORE 1851. By Mabel Tylecote. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1957; pp. x+346. 37s 6d.

At the time the lyceum was developing in the United States, the mechanics' institutes were flourishing in the British Isles. Although the two movements had many points in common, they were each shaped by their peculiar environments. The mechanics' institutes, the first of which were started in about 1823, were founded to provide adult education in the sciences and mechanical arts for workingmen. However, the scope of their activities soon broadened to include assembling libraries, providing recreation, and establishing instruction in elementary subjects. Mabel Tylecote reports that by 1850 six hundred of these and similar societies were operating in England. In addition there were fifty-five in Scotland, twelve in Wales, and twenty-five in Ireland. They had a membership of one hundred twenty thousand. In their libraries were eight hundred thousand volumes. Between five and six thousand lectures were delivered, and eighteen thousand members attended evening classes.

Previously information about the mechanics' institutes has been widely scattered, fragmentary, and difficult to locate. The two books considered in this review now present detailed and cogent studies of these institutes.

Thomas Kelly's title suggests that he has written only a biography of George Birkbeck (1776-1841), a Quaker doctor and teacher, who is recognized along with Lord Brougham as one of the significant men in adult education of the day. But in addition the book includes a history of Birkbeck's favorite project, the London Mechanics' Institution, which served as a model for many similar institutes. Part Two, consisting of three chapters, is devoted to "a brief general survey" of the movement as a whole. An outstanding feature of the appendices is an exhaustive list of over eight hundred institutes which operated in the British Isles up to 1851. The twenty-three page bibliography is conclusive proof of Kelly's industry and perseverance.

In contrast to the broader survey made by Kelly, Mabel Tylecote has limited her discussion to the institutes in textile districts of northern England, where popular education gained its greatest momentum. By 1850 one-third of English institutes were operating in this area. Yorkshire alone had one hundred fifty-one, while Lancashire had an additional sixty-eight. The opening chapters discuss early history of the movement, its aims and ideas, its educational and social problems. In the remainder of the book the author presents what she terms "a largely descriptive treatment" of individual institutes in Manchester, Huddersfield, Keighley, Halifax, Bradford, Stalybridge, and Ashton-under-Lyne. Much of this material has been gleaned from minute books, printed programs, and scattered miscellaneous papers. The author handles a myriad of details well. The bibliography, eighteen pages long, is of merit equal to that of the first book.

These two books offer considerable insight into the nature of popular education of the first half of the nineteenth century in the British Isles. In the beginning considerable doubt existed as to the advisability of educating the working class. The ruling and up-

per classes, still terrified by the French Revolution and democratic developments, were reluctant to encourage any institution that might stir the workingmen to make embarrassing demands. Under the guidance of men like George Birkbeck and Lord Brougham, adult education for the lower classes proved to be safe and a boon to orderly government and social betterment. The public lecture became one of its principal vehicles.

These two books deserve careful reading by students of public address. Students looking for areas for challenging research should find this movement a gold mine.

WALDO W. BRADEN
*Louisiana State University*

MELVILLE AS LECTURER. By Merton M. Sealts, Jr. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957; pp. ix+202. $4.00.

A book is seldom devoted to a man's lecturing career these days. Certainly Melville was no hit on the platform, and therefore it is his literary fame that excites curiosity in everything he undertook. Even so, this book fills a niche in the history of public address.

In 1857 Melville was fed up with professional writing and was hard pressed for cash. After the fashion of other literary figures, he turned to lecturing. He scratched his head for "a good, earnest subject," then decided upon "Statues in Rome." He reported on statues seen on his recent Mediterranean trip, offered thoughts on art and civilization, and worked in some social criticism. He spoke sixteen times under the auspices of lyceums, institutes, and associations, going west as far as Ohio. As the author of *Typee* and *Omoo*, Melville received polite, or better, attention on the whole, although newspaper reports reflect little awareness of his philosophical implications. Perhaps the sharpest criticisms were made of his delivery. He read the lecture. His voice was singsong; his words were lost in his mustache. One sympathetic reporter noted "a striking congeniality between this quiet manner and those mute forms that stand still and silent amid the venerable ruins of ancient Rome"—a remark susceptible to ironic interpretation in line with complaints about Melville's manner.

Melville's drawing power was the public image of him as "the man who lived among the cannibals," a billing he didn't relish. Nevertheless, he capitulated to public demand for something "more personal and modern" in choosing "The South Seas" as the topic for his second season. This lecture was more or less a hop-skip-jump account of the Pacific area, interlaced with yarns and social comment.

He spoke in ten cities, and again reactions were mixed. Most reports seem to suggest that he was more effective in reaching his audience this time and that he gave his listeners a satisfactory evening. A few reviews were hostile, denouncing his material, organization, and delivery. On this tour Melville ranged westward into Illinois, and regional tastes showed up in the reviews. On occasion he was contrasted with the animated Bayard Taylor, a favorite in these parts, or was endured until the hall could be cleared for Father Kemp's Old Folks Concert Troupe. Still "The South Seas" turned out better on the whole than did "Statues in Rome."

Melville's third lecture, called "Traveling," was a review of the pains, pleasures, and benefits of knocking around. He turned up only three engagements in the season of 1859-1860. The season was a failure, and Melville was through.

This book, then, is an account of Melville's chief occupation for three years. A major purpose is to throw light on his literary career, for the lectures are linked to his earlier writings and anticipate *Clarel* and *Billy Budd*. Mr. Sealts does a fine job in developing cross references between lectures and writings. But there are other values here. Admittedly, Melville was not remarkable as a lecturer, but his very mistakes and limitations confirm as fact that there is an art of speechmaking that cannot be ignored with impunity. Reactions to Melville not only suggest the point but also tell us much about his audiences and, in fairness to Melville, about their limitations. Therefore the book qualifies as literary, social, and speech history.

Mr. Sealts appears to have done a splendid job in research and analysis. He was denied much original material that has been lost, but evidently he has pulled together every remaining shred of evidence. From contemporary newspapers he reconstructed the substance of what Melville said, and these composite texts with notes are included. It is likely that Mr. Sealts has exhausted the subject of Melville as lecturer.

ERNEST J. WRAGE
*Northwestern University*

THE LOG-CABIN CAMPAIGN. By Robert Gray Gunderson. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1957; pp. xii+292. Illustrations, bibliographical note, and index. $7.50

The folkways of American politics have never

been quite the same since the rip-roaring campaign of 1840. Then, for the first time, a presidential candidate took his case directly to the people in stump speeches. Techniques of mass appeal, some of them introduced earlier by the followers of Andrew Jackson, were carried much farther by the campaigners for William Henry Harrison. These Whigs adopted and improved upon Democratic methods to win the election for "Tippecanoe and Tyler too." Yet Jackson's man, Martin Van Buren, running for re-election, got more votes than in 1836. An aroused electorate was brought to the polls in unprecedented numbers.

At last the subject receives its due. In *The Log-Cabin Campaign* Robert Gray Gunderson, placing events within their setting of economic depression and political discontent, tells the whole story from Harrison's nomination to his inauguration and death. Readers will find everything they might expect in an account of the election—the details of Whig organization and tactics, the Democratic efforts at counter-attack and the reasons for their futility. Readers also will find a bonus, as it were, in a number of other revelations. These include sidelights on the role of women in politics before the days of the Nineteenth Amendment. Though women could not vote in 1840, they could and did, as Gunderson shows, write pamphlets and make speeches, ride on floats and march in parades, use their persuasive wiles on husbands and sweethearts, and perform endless chores in fashioning banners and other paraphernalia and preparing feasts. Readers of *QJS* will be especially interested in Gunderson's analyses of campaign oratory and forensic devices of all kinds.

Besides acquainting himself with relevant monographs on phases of his subject, Gunderson has searched through an amazing number of scattered manuscripts, newspapers, and fugitive campaign materials. From these he has put together a work far superior to the mere fascinating miscellany that might have been produced by a less thoughtful and skillful author. The book is thoroughly thought through and beautifully organized. It is written with critical detachment and yet with all the vigor, vividness, and verve appropriate to the theme. The persons of the drama are never merely names: they spring to life in deft characterizations.

A critic is hard put to discover any grounds for adverse comment. He may point to a misprint on page 67 but to little or nothing else. He can only conclude by commending Professor Gunderson for a stimulating contribution to the fields of both history and speech, and the University of Kentucky Press for a fine job of bookmaking.

RICHARD N. CURRENT
*Woman's College,*
*University of North Carolina*

BOURBON LEADER: GROVER CLEVELAND AND THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY. By Horace Samuel Merrill. Boston: Little, Brown, 1957; pp. viii+224. $3.50.

Horace Samuel Merrill, professor of history at the University of Maryland, has written a scholarly but lively account of a formative period of American history. To a teacher of speech it is a disappointing biography, not because it is not well written, but because Grover Cleveland is an uninspiring subject for students of rhetoric.

As President of the United States and as leader of the Democratic party, Grover Cleveland "possessed the personal qualities to command, but not to lead." He first captured the attention of his countrymen as the foe of boss rule, and he maintained his independence throughout his political career. Yet he did not know how to frame a strong legislative program or how to use party machinery to unite his fellow Democrats in Congress. Least of all did he know how to rally popular support.

In all the references to Cleveland's speaking in Professor Merrill's study, only one suggests the possibility of skillful leadership from the public platform: his first inaugural address was delivered from memory, with closer audience contact than was customary on such occasions. In the campaign of 1884, however, he made only four speeches, characterized by "obvious sincerity, a solemn manner, ponderous phraseology and a vocabulary that reflected his legalistic and Calvinistic background." As President, he seldom spoke before audiences, and in the campaign of 1888 he took the position that it would be undignified for him to speak at all.

In a day when Populist orators were crying out against a malfunctioning economic system and William Jennings Bryan was becoming the voice of rising dissatisfaction with the status quo, it is ironical that Cleveland steadfastly refused to use the great prestige of the Presidency to set forth and defend a constructive conservative program. He was convinced that honest administration was enough. As an

isolated example, he would seem to be proof that public speaking is of little consequence in American public life. The ultimate acceptance of the greater part of the program advocated by the noisy Populists would argue otherwise.

CHARLES W. LOMAS
*University of California at Los Angeles*

THE CULTURAL LIFE OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES, 1607-1763. By Louis B. Wright. New American Nation Series. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. xvi+292. $5.00.

To the lengthening list of titles in Harper's New American Nation Series, the director of the Folger Shakespeare Library has entered a generally useful and eminently readable contribution. The purpose of the Series, as set forth by its chief editors, Commager and Morris, is to undertake "a judicious appraisal of the new history, a cautious application of the new techniques of investigation and presentation, and a large-scale effort to achieve a synthesis of the new findings with the traditional facts, and to present the whole in attractive literary form." Within the pattern and scope of these large aims, Mr. Wright has been assigned the formidable task of encompassing the "cultural life" of the first century and a half of the American colonies—of "depicting how the colonists lived, the faiths and goals that inspired them, and the manner in which their lives were enriched."

In proceeding to his assignment, the author has begun by framing his canvas with an impartial eye to interests both mercantile and agrarian, rural and urban, and with a fair regard to the middle and southern as well as to the New England colonies. He has then sketched the main aspects of his subject in a series of topical chapter headings: "Diversity of Religions," "Zeal for Education," "Books, Libraries and Learning," "Literary Production," "Drama, Music, and Other Diversions," "Architecture and the Decorative Arts," "Scientific Interest and Observation," and "The Press and Communications." This accomplished, Mr. Wright's last task has been to add those thousand strokes of datum and detail, of organization and observation, which bring color and substance to his completed picture of American colonial culture.

The satisfaction with which one views Mr. Wright's completed canvas will depend, no doubt, on the extent to which one is willing to put aside the spectacles of one's own special interest and to examine the work with the generalist's amiable eye. Certainly any reader who turns to this book for significant comment on the role of the orator and the place of rhetorical discourse in colonial society will be disappointed; for he will find that Mr. Wright's treatment of this aspect of the cultural scene is both scanty and superficial—and this in spite of the opportunities implicit in the title of the final chapter of the book. But "communications" to Mr. Wright—as, indeed, to many others—is a blanket term of the most generous proportions; and so, while we learn something of the contributions and conditions of printers and the press, of correspondents and the postal service, of "stage wagons" and roads, we find little in the book concerning the speaker and his discourse. We are told, somewhat at random, that speaking went on in the courtrooms and churches, about the campfire and in the academy, and that the influence of the tavern "as a source of information and communication can hardly be over-estimated"; but to any questions with regard to the rhetorical function and quality of the stream of discourse, the author remains consistently oblivious. That the writer of a book of this kind is largely dependent on secondary sources, is obvious enough; and that in the area of colonial public address such sources are sparse indeed, must be admitted. Yet nothing in Mr. Wright's appended collection of bibliographical essays suggests an awareness of such studies as are available in the back issues of this journal and of *Speech Monographs*, or in the pages of the *History and Criticism of American Public Address* and the *History of Speech Education in America*. One can scarcely avoid thinking that this book would have had greater value, not merely to readers in our field but to readers generally, had Mr. Wright brought into the scope of his general synthesis such "new findings" as scholars in speech have made available. Or to put the matter in another way, one wishes that Mr. Wright had given to public address a section of sustained, informative, and focused comment similar to the dozen pages which he devotes to the drama.

Undoubtedly, the writer of cultural history turns his hand to a complex and troublesome task, and no doubt it is easy to ask too much of him. To have completed a readable survey of colonial cultural history which will surely enlighten and entertain the general reader, is indeed an accomplishment; and this, one must say to his credit, Mr. Wright has done.

LELAND M. GRIFFIN
*Northwestern University*

AMERICA'S FIRST HAMLET. By Grace Overmyer. New York: New York University Press, 1957; pp. 439. $6.50.

"The first native American who, either as an actor or a dramatic writer, ever attracted attention and secured a firm stand on the other side of the ocean . . . whose pieces have been . . . adopted there as the stock pieces of the national theatres."

Despite the glowing phrases of Gabriel Harrison's biographical tribute (1875), John Howard Payne is best known to the present generation as the author of "Home Sweet Home." *America's First Hamlet* is predominately successful in its aim of "turning a legend into a human being," although its author's seeming reluctance (especially in Part Two: 1813 to 1832) to venture back-stage necessarily deprives this narrative of much valuable information.

Payne's history is traced from the early years of a boy-wonder's *Thespian Mirror* (1805-06) and a boy-playwright's *Julia; or, The Wanderer* (one performance), through some academic misadventures at Union College, inevitably to his stage debut at the Park in Home's *Douglas*—and a brief yet brilliant career as boy-actor ("The American Roscius"). Part One of Miss Overmyer's book ends with his departure for London, as a young gentleman of twenty-one. The remaining two sections deal with Payne's twenty years in England and on the Continent, during which he achieved international celebrity as playwright and man of the theatre (yet experienced continual financial hardship); with his return to America in 1832; and with the two final decades of his life, dedicated to journalism, Indian affairs in the Far West, and service as American consul in Tunis.

Miss Overmyer has recorded most relevant facts concerning Payne's disheartening business dealings with Drury Lane and Covent Garden. His durable tragedy *Brutus* and a spate of adaptations of French melodramas (some co-authored with Washington Irving) earned tremendous sums for managers Kinnaird and Harris (as for others), but netted their creator a mere pittance. And the details of Payne's ill-fated interlude as manager of Sadler's Wells (April-November, 1820), which landed him in Fleet Prison for debt, are duly set down, along with this modest defense:

The work of Phelps at the Wells is still referred to as "a daring project"; but the fact remains that two decades before him, a young American had first explored the higher possibilities of London's oldest theater.

The record of Payne's histrionic exploits in America and England is here but fragmentary, however, for this biographer's interest is more keenly attracted by his affair with Emelia Von Harten and an exchange of letters with Mary Shelley than by his acting. It is singular that a book whose title celebrates Payne's being the first American to play Hamlet should omit both the date of this performance (April 17, 1809) and that of his London debut (June 4, 1813). Fascinating commentary on the techniques of Cooke, Kean, Kemble, and Mrs. Siddons in Payne's June 1817 letter to his sister (given in full by Harrison) is ignored; and there is all too little here regarding playwright Payne's relations with American performers.

The author's generally reliable and workmanlike researching (the text is documented by twenty-six pages of notes and an ample bibliography) thus occasionally falters in Anglo-American theatre history. Rather more discouraging than her proposal that Payne in 1809 wrote Kemble's *Lodoiska* (1794) is Miss Overmyer's neglect of the abundant (though far-flung) Payne material in American collections.

PAT M. RYAN, JR.
*Yale University*

CRITICAL MOMENTS: KENNETH BURKE'S CATEGORIES AND CRITIQUES. By George Knox. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1957; pp. xxiv+131. $3.50.

Perhaps no one in our time has provoked more excitement in the field of literary analysis than has Kenneth Burke. "From about 1940, just about everybody who is anybody in literary criticism, or who would like to be thought of as having something to say about anybody who is anybody in literary criticism, has taken a try at placing Kenneth Burke," says the author of the above work. Knox, zealous of Burke's reputation, and believing that Burke's role as a linguistic student of human affairs poses a difficulty in understanding for anyone who would take him on the wing, carves out for himself a job of explication and synthesis. He hopes to reach a new audience who can profit from Burke.

In the main, the author tries to maintain a sense of Burke's development as a critic. He also attempts to use Burke's "dramatistic" method of analysis and presentation in order to give emphasis to Burke's theory of literature as "symbolic action." Seven chapters, each devoted to one of Burke's key critical concepts, are presented: permanency, symbolic action, progressive form, the intrinsic, the comic at-

titude, pliance of perspective, cluster analysis, and sociological criticism. A section of notes and a bibliography of Burke's writings are also included.

Where to begin an analysis of Burke's writings and by what methods he may be made most intelligible to students and laymen are serious problems for an explicator. The initiated may undoubtedly profit from Knox's explication of key critical concepts. He may also attain deeper insights into Burke's four major modes of approach to literature and human nature, viz., the logical, rhetorical, poetic, and ethical. That "just plain readers" whom the author also hopes to reach will profit much from the synthesis is doubtful. If part of Burke's difficulty lies in vocabulary and slipperiness of key concepts, then much of the difficulty remains. The length of Knox's book does not permit him to explain and illustrate in any detail the more difficult concepts in Burke's critical system and their relationship with each other. If another part of Burke's difficulty lies in his application of a "dramatistic" mode of analysis and presentation, then the present author, in employing a similar mode of analysis and exposition, does not go far toward removing basic difficulties. Until someone approaches Burkeian analysis with greater simplicity in expository form than does the present author, it is doubtful that Burke will yield his secrets.

The author notes a dominant Freudian influence in the writings of Burke. One wonders if Burke can best be made clear by more systematically revealing the Aristotelian and Kantian influences which are equally dominant and which doubtless provide the background out of which Burke's most seminal thought grows.

MARIE HOCHMUTH
*University of Illinois*

SOUND AND POETRY. Edited with an Introduction by Northrop Frye. New York: Columbia University Press, 1957; pp. xxviii+156. $3.75.

The title of this collection of essays and the prefatory note promise more than the book delivers. *Sound and Poetry* is a broad and promising designation, and the editor of the collection asserts that the essays under this heading comprise a "well unified and logically developed volume." However, the unity and the logic, in the opinion of this reviewer, are fragmentary, and the scope is more limited than the title suggests. This is not to say that the essays are unrelated to the subject or unrewarding as reading. All of them bear in some way on the general topic, and although uneven in quality, all are in varying degrees useful and stimulating. How useful and how stimulating will depend on the special interest of each reader because the essays are written for the scholar more than for the average reader of poetry.

Probably the essay with broadest appeal is the introductory paper by Northrop Frye, who also serves as editor of the volume. His discussion of "Lexis and Melos" offers a useful clarification of the term "musical" as applied to poetry; it also exposes the misuses of the term and outlines the basic problems inherent in a study of melos and lexis.

Six essays follow the introductory paper, all of them the product of recent conferences of the English Institute. They are, in the editor's words, "Six variations on a central theme . . . as worked out from six scholarly points of view: those of musical composition, of musicological criticism, of musicological history, of rhetoric, of rhetorical analysis, and of linguistics."

The first essay, by Edward T. Cone, discusses a composer's problem when he gives a musical setting to a poetic text. The second paper, by Frederick W. Sternfeld, analyzes the musical influences on and characteristics of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, tracing how the poet used "wandering melodies" as settings for new texts, how he transferred modes of expression from a musical to a verbal organization, and how he used Mozart's *Don Giovanni* as an analogue for *Ulysses*.

The third essay, by John Hollander, entitled "Musica Mundana and Twelfth Night," is a discussion of Shakespeare's reinterpretation of the accepted musical ideas of his age in dramatic contexts with particular reference to *Twelfth Night*.

These first three papers comprise Part One of the book, which bears the subtitle "The Poetry of Sound," while the last three essays constitute Part Two, "The Sound of Poetry." It is in the second half of the book that the teacher of speech, particularly the teacher of oral interpretation, will find ideas directly applicable to his problems, for here is an essay on "Structure, Sound, and Meaning" by Craig La Drière, an essay on "Spenser and Milton: Some Parallels and Contrasts in the Handling of Sound" by Ants Oras, and finally an essay entitled "From Linguistics to Poetry," by Harold Whitehall. The latter stresses the belief that linguistic analysis is basic to literary criticism, and shows the possibilities of the "linguistic criticism of poetry" by applying it to sound-pattern, rhyme, and metrics and suggesting that even literary appreciation may eventually be the domain of

the linguist rather than of the traditional literary scholar.

As a whole, the book is a worthy introduction to several aspects of the subject of "sound and poetry," but the essays do not always focus as directly on the subject as one might wish, nor do they exhaust the possibilities of any single aspect of the subject.

GARFF B. WILSON
*University of California, Berkeley*

SCANDAL AND PARADE: THE THEATER OF JEAN COCTEAU. By Neal Oxenhandler. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1957; pp. x+284. $5.00.

Prompted to answer those critics of Jean Cocteau who have held him to be vacuous, mysterious without depth, or compounded of charlatanry, Neal Oxenhandler has indeed succeeded in disentangling the elements of Cocteau's theatrical-dramatic works, and insofar as possible has succeeded in ordering them into a pattern of meaning. Cocteau's own cryptic, often elliptical comments on his theatre pieces, poetic though they may be, give us, Oxenhandler believes, too few clues to this meaning. Although he has examined Cocteau's antecedents —the French romantic tradition and its descendent symbolism, the poets Mallarmé and Valéry, and Maurice Barrés—and more contemporary influences upon him from Gide through the German expressionists to Maritain and Sartre, he calls such an attempt to define Cocteau's ideas a "distortion, a falsification, due to the external, historical perspective."

On the sensible premise that plot is metaphor, the author, Assistant Professor of Romance Languages at the University of California at Los Angeles, provides his most valuable analytical comment in the specific examinations of individual theatre pieces. "Theatre pieces" they are, for want of a better word; Cocteau has created ballet ideas, pantomimes, and scenarios for films, as well as his dramas, which range in form from near-surrealism and expressionism to the naturalism of *Les Parents terribles* and the deliberate re-echoing of earlier French romantic melodrama in *The Eagle Has Two Heads*.

Everything within the play becomes plot in his definition: spectacle as scandal or parade (in the sense of fore-play) or surprise is used, as is poetry, which is an intuition of the poet by himself, added to verbal and sensual excitement. His "heroes are most dramatically successful when they are placed in a persecution situation." They escape, uncommitted, into poetry "as charm." On the verge of commitment they seek refuge in mythomania, which is adulation of some one else, or in angelism, which, paradoxically, is purity in debauchery, naïve immorality, tender pity, and cruelty, all in one. In the pretense of acting such roles these characters gain courage to face their inevitable destruction. Hence Cocteau's negative tragedy, one for our times, is of impotent will against fear, "the protean antagonist of all his plays." As playwright Cocteau occasionally may have failed in coherence, says Oxenhandler, but at least he has attempted the heroic in a world no longer with the power to recognize heroism. Among other virtues of this beautifully articulated criticism of a playwright's work is a theatre-wise recognition of the place of the actor in the creative process of playmaking, in this instance Jean Marais.

ROBERT J. DIERLAM
*Stanford University*

MAN IN HIS THEATRE. By Samuel Selden. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1957; pp. ix+113. $3.00.

On the dust jacket John Gassner writes, "*Man In His Theatre* is quite the most pleasant and stimulating general essay on dramatic art and its relation to primal human drives that I have read in years." This reviewer heartily agrees.

*Man In His Theatre* is not a textbook; it is not even a reference book; it certainly is not a handbook; indeed, it has virtually no practical use whatsoever. Yet it should be read and reread by every man of the theatre. Its cover should become soiled from the gentle turning of many thumbs. Why?

*Man In His Theatre* has a poetic quality; it is a sort of ode to the theatre and the men in it. It is an explanation of the great forces, the undying urges, the restless cry of man who has reflected his wants and drives and needs in an art form called theatre.

If this appraisal seems somewhat lyric, it is because this hard-headed reviewer has identified himself with this little essay. There is a tender quality to the telling. You may agree or disagree with the premise. You may agree or disagree with the method of development. You may agree or disagree with the conclusions. All must agree to just one thing—Samuel Selden loves men and loves the theatre. Here is the proof.

I shall neither try to codify the book, nor outline it, not pick out small bits or tatters for criticism. I merely say—*read it*.

JOHN E. DIETRICH
*The Ohio State University*

NOVELS INTO FILM. By George Bluestone. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1957; pp. xvi+237. $5.00.

FILM AS ART. By Rudolf Arnheim. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957; pp. 230. Paper $1.50.

While film makers scurry nervously in an effort to salvage an industry, publishers are releasing a flurry of books devoted to the art of film. At first glance, this might seem to be the publishers' opportune benediction. Another look suggests a wishful notion that the publishing activity augurs a shift in emphasis from industry to art; there may be a faint hint of an industry's dilemma resulting in a public's release from banality and mediocrity.

These volumes treat aesthetic elements of film, emphasizing "linguistic" characteristics. Both are concerned with the process of selecting from reality; one finds its "reality" in the novel.

*Novels into Film* is a comparative study of film and novel. The author systematically discusses the meaning underlying omissions, deletions, and alterations discovered in the film adaptations of six novels: *The Informer, Wuthering Heights, Pride and Prejudice, The Grapes of Wrath, The Ox-Bow Incident,* and *Madame Bovary.*

Before presenting his six case studies, the author provides a thorough synthesis of the literature which deals with roles, meanings, linguistic elements, and the publics of both film and novel. Bluestone furnishes a comprehensive treatment of the subject matter; in addition, he has contributed a model for comparative content analysis where the product of one medium of expression serves as the "reality" for another medium.

Underlying Bluestone's research is the belief that the filmist becomes not a translator for an author, but a new author. "If one is asked," he says, " 'How do you like the Greek "Electra"?' one must reply, 'By whom? Sophocles or Euripides?' And, if one is asked, 'How do you like *The Informer*?' one must reply, 'By whom? O'Flaherty or Ford?' " This view does not release the critic from an obligation to measure the relative merits of the given novel and its film counterpart, but it liberates him from the myth that there must be a faithful superimposure of language, sequence, and duration.

The greater part of *Film as Art* is from *Film,* a 1933 translation of the author's *Film als Kunst.* The remainder contains two previously published articles and two articles which are printed for the first time in this new paperback edition.

Although the author has edited his own earlier work and has supplied a new note of introduction, none of the original manuscripts was written later than 1938.

Arnheim's *Film* was the first comprehensive effort to structure an aesthetic theory of film; it is considered a classic contribution. *Film as Art* is an improvement; it has shed the excess baggage of first efforts and has retained those passages which continue to be relevant. This is no mere reprint, nor is it an updating abridgment. Rather, Arnheim has undated his writing.

The most fascinating element continues to be Arnheim's *Materialtheorie;* this theory and its byproducts are the structural underpinnings for the author's judgments. He proposes that creative representations of reality are not as dependent on the subject matter itself as they are on the properties of the medium; also, the very limitations which make it impossible for a medium to provide an exact representation of reality are the tools of the artist. Going one step further, we are told that as technical improvements continue to bring the representational media closer to reality, the opportunities for artistic arrangement decrease.

While the articles are connected neither to each other nor to the chapters from the earlier book, they provide profitable reading. Particularly intriguing is an article which records Arnheim's 1935 thoughts on television; his observations are often provocative. For example, he says, "The more perfect our means of direct experience, the more easily we are caught by the dangerous illusion that perceiving is tantamount to knowing and understanding." After discussing television at some length, Arnheim concludes that "the 'viewer' who cannot even laugh or applaud without feeling ridiculous [in his isolation], is the final product of a century-long development, which has led from the campfire, the market place, and the arena to the lonesome consumer of spectacles today."

GORDON L. GRAY
*Michigan State University*

THE ORDER OF PRESENTATION IN PERSUASION. Edited by Carl I. Hovland. New Haven: Published for The Institute of Human Relations by Yale University Press, 1957; pp. x+192. $4.00.

This is Volume I in the series called "Yale Studies in Attitude and Communication." It is a report of eight studies arranged under *Part One:* Order Effects in Successive Communica-

tions, and *Part Two:* Order Effects within a Communication. There are ten writers all told and Dr. Hovland has written the introductory and summary chapters. He is a professor of psychology at Yale. The three Appendices and a list of forty-three references complete the volume.

Other reviewers will treat this work in various ways. Here we propose to examine it by asking, "Is the research valuable to a speaker or a teacher of the making of speeches—especially of speech composition?"

The problems of writing a speech are legion. And since the days of Corax and Tisias the matter of order has been of paramount importance. Every school-boy debater has pondered whether to save his "best" argument for the end of his speech or to lead off with it, whether to treat his opponent's "best" argument quickly and boldly or to belittle or ignore it, whether to strive for a judge's favor by making it easy for him to recall a point made early or at the end of a presentation. Every husband has pondered whether he should break "bad news" to his wife right off or "prepare" her for it. President Eisenhower has without doubt had to decide many times when and with what emphasis he will make his strong points.

What does this book tell us? Here is a quoted summary of main findings:

1. When two sides of an issue are presented successively by different communicators, the side presented first does not necessarily have the advantage.

2. If, after hearing only one side of a controversial issue, a response is made which publicly indicates one's position on the issue, the effectiveness of a subsequent presentation of the second side of the issue is reduced, thus entailing a primacy effect.

3. The mere act of stating one's opinion anonymously on a questionnaire after hearing only one side of an issue does not significantly reduce the effectiveness of the second side.

4. When contradictory information is presented in a single communication, by a single communicator, there is a pronounced tendency for those items presented first to dominate the impression received.

5. The primacy effect found in presenting contradictory information in the same communication was reduced by interpolating other activities between the two blocks of information and by warning the subjects against the fallibility of first impressions.

6. Presentation of information relevant to the satisfaction of needs after these needs have been aroused brings about greater acceptance than an order which presents the information first and the need-arousal second.

7. Order of presentation is a more significant factor in influencing opinion for subjects with relatively weak desire for understanding, than for those with "high cognitive need."

8. Placing communications highly desirable to the recipient first, followed by those less desirable, produces more opinion change than the reverse order.

9. When an authoritative communicator plans to mention pro arguments and also non-salient con arguments, the pro-first order is superior to the con-first order.

It is unfortunate that there is not room here to explain fully what these nine findings mean or how they were discovered. Let it be stated, however, that the subjects were undergraduate psychology students (Yale, Columbia, Hofstra) and high school students from New York City and New Haven, Connecticut. The material tested was in written form. The conditions of the classroom testing situation are often artificial and contrived and they seldom resemble those a *speaker* actually meets.

Remembering these facts, is the book useful to speakers and teachers of speaking? Yes, in the senses that it *suggests* certain ways to present ideas and that it opens up new problems and inquiries for researchers. No, in the sense that you cannot reliably depend on the findings. They were produced under hot-house conditions, "precise controlled experimentation," by persons who have great difficulty in making themselves clear. (Do you have confidence in the doctor who describes your ailment in big words at great length?) If you were being tried for murder would it be worth your life to tell your lawyer to base his plea on the recommendations of these ten social psychologists? The answer is No. He should consult some old and experienced practical courtroom pleader.

This book is typical of much that passes for research in the social sciences. It verifies the obvious. It complicates the simple. It raises new questions galore. It is full of jargon. It will appeal to experimental psychologists—who will quarrel with its methods and produce another book with different results.

For the speech profession: Of the forty-three references cited one is a textbook by two teachers of speech, one is a study appearing in *Speech Monographs* in 1950. Is this the best we can do?

HAROLD F. HARDING
*The Ohio State University*

TARHEEL TALK. By Norman E. Eliason. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1956; pp. x+324. $5.00.

Despite the suggestion of popular treatment in its title, this book belongs in the tradition of Krapp's *English Language in America* (1925) and Orbeck's *Early New England Pronunciation* (1927). Like its two important predecessors, it is based on the analysis of large collections of documents, in this instance on the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina. From the legal papers, plantation books, church records, letters, diaries, and other miscellaneous documents preserved in the Collection, the author has assembled evidence on vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation within the colony and state of North Carolina from the earliest settlement to 1860.

It is, of course, arbitrary to confine linguistic investigations within the borders of a single American state, as the author himself points out:

> There are in fact almost no features of grammar, pronunciation, or vocabulary that are truly peculiar to the state. Its speech is a composite of features, some of them common to the English language as a whole, some to American English, some to the Southern dialect, and so forth; what is distinctive about it is only the particular way these various features have been combined and distributed in North Carolina. (p. 4.)

What is distinctive about the book is the thorough analysis the author has given the combination and distribution of these various features.

After introductory chapters on the background, the writings, and language attitudes and differences, the author goes on to long chapters on vocabulary, pronunciation, and grammar. Two appendices contain lists of word usages and significant spellings.

This book should add to the reader's information and understanding of North Carolina and its speech, and to his understanding of the state's relationship to the South and to the larger American scene. The present reviewer has been informed and edified. In only a few minor instances does he wish to cavil. For instance, on page 191 the author refers to the three main regional types of American speech as Southern, Midland, and Northern, and then refers to the three types of the Kenyon-Knott *Pronouncing Dictionary* as if they were the same. But of Kenyon-Knott's Eastern, Northern, and Southern, only Southern can be said to correspond even roughly with the Southern area of Professor Eliason and the Linguistic Atlas investigators.

On page 192 the author writes:

> It is, for example, hard to tell whether a speaker is from Pennsylvania, Ohio, Iowa, or Colorado but fairly easy to guess whether he is from Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, Mississippi, or Texas. Even within a single Southern state, variability is noticeable, and nowhere more so than in North Carolina, where social and geographical pronunciation variants intermingle in almost bewildering confusion.

The present reviewer suggests that there are strongly noticeable variants within Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Iowa, if not in Colorado. Pennsylvania has at least three main variational regions, possibly five, certainly enough to give the investigator as much trouble as North Carolina.

On page 197 the author writes, "In the west the *r* type has probably always been more common, and Scotch-Irish influence is a plausible explanation." Migration from Pennsylvania is an equally plausible explanation. Upstate New York, with no appreciable Scotch-Irish infiltration, also retains *r*. Remoteness from the Atlantic seaboard, where the new fashions arrived, might be the most plausible explanation of all for both western New York and western North Carolina.

But these are minor matters, differences of opinion. They do not detract from the excellence of the book, which should be recommended to all teachers of speech as an important case study in the development of American English and as an excellent supplement to Krapp's *English Language in America*.

C. K. THOMAS
*Cornell University*

VERBAL BEHAVIOR. By B. F. Skinner. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957; pp. xii+478. $5.50.

The present text represents an attempt by an eminently qualified psychologist to establish a genuine science of verbal behavior, upon which may be erected a structure of control and prediction. The author approaches the problem from the point of view of neobehavioristic determinism; the behaviorial sciences, particularly psychology, must assume the final responsibility for such an undertaking, for "what happens when a man speaks or responds to speech is clearly a question about human behavior and hence a question to be answered with the con-

cepts and techniques of psychology as an experimental science of behavior."

In a functional analysis of verbal behavior the basic tasks are *description* and *explanation* —the topography of this particular aspect of human activity, the conditions relevant to its occurrence, and the variables of which it is a function. Out of these arise still further problems, for "verbal behavior is usually the effect of multiple causes." From the functional control of these independent variables arise new forms of behavior which have their "effects upon the listener, whose behavior then calls for analysis." Further problems arise from the fact that the speaker is also a listener, reacting to his own behavior. "The speaker and listener within the same skin engage in activities which are traditionally described as 'thinking.'"

Basic to the analysis which the book represents is the "verbal operant" (only approximated by the traditional "word"), which is essentially "a unit of behavior composed of a response of identifiable form functionally related to one or more independent variables." This verbal operant may be anything from a single speech sound or an inflectional or stress pattern to a complete sentence, so long as it is a unit occurring "as a function of a certain variable." Basic also is the "three-term contingency," consisting of *stimulus-response-reinforcement*, the last term referring to any way of "controlling the probability of occurrence of a given class of verbal responses."

Upon these basic concepts, and others growing out of them, the author has built his analysis of verbal behavior. It is an interesting, even intriguing analysis, which throws new light on various facets of human communication. His brief, but apropos, excursions into such areas as reading, drama, rhetoric, even speech pathology, have particular application to different aspects of speech, even though we may be reluctant to accept some of his formulations. Classical rhetoric, for example, contributed much more than "an elaborate system of terms describing the characteristics of literary works of art, applicable as well to everyday speech"; and stagefright probably occurs even when the audience is not potentially critical or "otherwise negatively reinforcing."

On the whole, I found the work revealing, stimulating. While not all of the elements in the analysis are entirely original—sources are represented only in the footnotes and in a rather inadequate index—the synthesis presents verbal behavior in a new light which should illuminate the subject as no previous writing has done.

A few details treated somewhat differently might make the work even more acceptable to students of speech and perhaps others. For instance, the terminology, in which a number of new and original terms are introduced, might be more specifically translated into terms of greater currency. Furthermore, some consideration might be given to the influence of different media as controlling variables—the significance of immediate as contrasted with delayed reinforcement. Finally, although psychology is unquestionably involved in verbal behavior, it is not the whole of the story. Granted that it is indispensable in any complete study of communication, it must also be insisted that other areas of thought make significant contributions as well.

GILES WILKESON GRAY
*Louisiana State University*

LANGUAGE: AN ENQUIRY INTO ITS MEANING AND FUNCTION. Planned and Edited by Ruth Nanda Anshen. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. xviii+366. Trade $6.00, text $4.50.

Taken simply as a collection of essays, this is an uneven book, ranging from the elegant through the obvious to the awful.

Taken as a book dealing with language, it is inadequate, largely because much of it does *not* deal with language at all. Far too often it rambles off (sometimes most interestingly) into philosophy, theology, symbolism, mysticism, poetics, dramaturgy.

A book of diverse essays resists generalization and, as a rule, generalization is unnecessary. But this claims to be "a synthesis." It was "planned and edited" as part of a series dealing with "The Science of Culture."

True, we are forewarned that the volume "draws attention to the mystery, the miracle and the magic of language." Such alliterations do not yield easily to an inquiry. And again, in the editor's characteristically steamy Ouidaesque prose, "It is language, full-panoplied and alive, issuing hot and pulsating from the human mouth, . . . severed from all practical, all immediate applicability which here demands our investigation." "*The point of view of the authors*" is that semantics is "a necessary and even valuable cleansing of the Augean stables of language." Perhaps.

But in fact, there is no such measure of agreement. Many healthy contradictions appear. Nor is there a central, unitary theme: "language" is taken as an endlessly productive (and necessarily ill-defined) metaphor. Each author writes in terms of the techniques of his special in-

terest. Where that interest is language as such, the title is justified. For the remainder, certain themes naïvely recur: the origin of language; the equation of primitive languages with proto-languages; the idea that the central aspect of language is word, not structure; the failure to discriminate between Language, a specific language (e.g., English), and the act of language (speech). It is chastening to the fields of speech and linguistics to learn how little known (or little understood?) their demonstrations are.

Individually, a number of articles—some hardly mentioning language—are admirable. Prof. Jakobson's is penetrating. Leo Spitzer treats of the "Language of Poetry" handsomely, as Jean P. de Menasce does with the "Philosophy of Translation." R. P. Blackmur has a witty, beautifully written essay; Huntington Cairns a carefully reasoned one on the "Language of Jurisprudence" (of interest to rhetoricians among others). One by Tur-Sinai on origins of language forms is highly controversial.

Beyond warning high-strung phoneticians away from Swami Nikhilananda and Erich Fromm, let each reader ascertain his own dislikes.

Conclusion: some of the parts are interesting of themselves. There is no whole.

WILLIAM KAY ARCHER
*Hunter College*

A HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE. By Albert C. Baugh. Second edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957; pp. xviii+506. $5.50.

I adopted the first edition as soon as it was off the press, in 1935. It was an excellent book for what has to be covered in any undergraduate course in the English language. This is the same excellent book. The preface states that the revisions have been designed only to bring the treatment up to date. There are a few minor changes in wording or in examples and considerable additions to the bibliographical references. Only the half-dozen pages concerned with the dialect areas in the United States are said to have been entirely rewritten. The section numbers are the same throughout, with the same headings except as "The World Wars" replaces "The World War" and "English in the Empire" "English in the Colonies"; only "Cultural Levels and Functional Varieties" suggests a change in point of view from "Levels of Usage." Sometimes the revision doesn't get made, as where we are still asked to "go back only six generations" to Pope's *Essay on Criticism*, and where *fingerprint* and *lipstick* are still noted as "of recent origin."

Professor Baugh is not indifferent to the tremendous advances made in the techniques of linguistic study in the last two decades, many of them pertinent to diachronic treatment. He has simply decided not to use them, and says so. The consequence may well be that the work is the more generally useful, both for the run of courses for which it is designed and for the use of teachers of speech, to whom this review is addressed.

What I liked about the book was that it furnished students with the breadth of information they should have, some of which I was not much excited about, and left me free to deal with what I wanted to deal with. I never had to fight the book. When I wanted to talk about the Great Vowel Shift, for example. I could go on from Baugh's one-page summary to such length as seemed to me advisable, and the same when I wanted students to do a sizeable job on semantic change.

I rather think teachers of speech should look upon the book in this light. No course in phonetics in a department of speech can ignore the phonological development of the language altogether; what any particular teacher does is bound to be conditioned by his particular fetishes. He, the teacher, cannot afford, however, to have his knowledge limited to what he is going to pass on to undergraduate students, and he needs not only a pretty wide familiarity with the phonology but also an adequate familiarity with the other aspects of the history of the language. This he can get, at least in an elaborately sketchy way, from this book. Any graduate student in whose program phonetic study has an even minor place should con a book like Baugh's—I know of none better. It is not the book for complete study of a main line, such as, for us, American dialects.

LEE S. HULTZÉN
*University of Illinois*

APPLIED PHONETICS. By Claude M. Wise. Illustrated by H. S. Wise. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1957; pp. xii+546. $10.00.

This magnificent book (or is it two?) will be not only one more for the reference room, it will be (welcome) required reading for those who have outgrown the Herman volumes and the amusement response on hearing *boosh*, *grayuft*, *droring*, etc. Phoneticians at large, of whom at least a hundred are cited in the work, and their students, or any students of speech and language, please note.

Part I is an introduction to general, quite non-prescriptive phonetics, not without abun-

dant phonemic, acoustic, and physiological evidence, and some fine figures by the author's gifted son. Could it have been made a little more elementary? Some students desperately need help on symbols from a workbook like Van Riper and Smith's.

All honor to Wise for his adherence to I.P.A. symbols. A more direct aid than any phonetic "alphabet," however, is the Language Master. Kantner and West's *Phonetics*, though difficult in symbols, is clear and helpful on underlying theory. In special symbol variation Hultzén's ". . . Post Vocalic R . . . ," *QJS*, April 1950, is for the more ambitious.

Some oversights: spelling of *guttural* (p. 65), two-year pre-dating of I.P.A. use of Broad Romic (p. 8), no word of Mencken's *American Language* and Sumner Ives' study of Joel Chandler Harris (PADS) for phonetics and eye-dialect.

Eye-dialect plays a fascinating role. The term dialect here includes sub-standard *and* standard forms. Specifically covered are: General, Southern, Eastern American; British, Cockney, Scottish, Irish; New York City, Southern Negro, Southern Mountain; French (including Louisiana and Canadian), German (including Pennsylvania German), Yiddish, Norwegian, Italian, Russian, Brazilian, Portuguese.

Though he does not mention Sever Pop's *Dialectologie*, Wise is steeped in linguistic geography and in the language of international students. Hence the actor-interpreter can find what he wants in *Applied Phonetics*, except for intonation. We still lack American recordings comparable to the British Armstrong-Ward and Palmer-Blandford; though the Language Master has made a promising start.

If *Applied Phonetics* is really two (paperback?) books, only the author and publisher can tell where to divide them. As it stands, the one book is a monument in two fields, phonetics and dialects.

BERT EMSLEY
*The Ohio State University*

A DICTIONARY OF AMERICAN-ENGLISH USAGE. By Margaret Nicholson. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957; pp. xii+671. $5.00.

This book is an adaptation of Fowler's *Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. To quote the Preface, "AEU is a simplified MEU, with American variations, retaining as much of the original as space allowed." The author recognizes, of course, that it is dangerous to adapt or modify so highly personal a monument as *Modern English Usage*. The question is whether she should have tried. Fowler was highly opinionated, he had no special knowledge of American usage, and his linguistic science is now almost completely out of date. It is much as if somebody should adapt and modify Mencken and call the result *The British Language*.

The word *American* in the title is misleading. There is an entry for the British *bank holiday*, but none for the American *legal holiday*. The entry for *city* refers to the London financial district; there is no reference to American use of the word, nor to *Wall Street*. The British *sleeping partner* is here, but not the American *silent partner*. There are entries for *aluminum*, *jemmy* (for the American burglar's *jimmy*), *liquorice*, and *serjeant*, with the American spellings given only incidentally. Material with a strongly British flavor dominates the illustrative phrases and sentences under many of the entries; see, for instance, those for *comma*, *neither*, and *titles*. The entry for *commencement* includes no reference to the American college ceremonies. What is American in all this?

The linguistic entries are singularly unsatisfactory. We learn, for instance, that the *aspirate* is the sound of the letter *h* in *hot;* then we learn that it is not "fused" as in *than* and *chin*. Surely the author must know that there has never been an [h] sound to be "fused" in either of these words. There is no mention of aspirated or unaspirated voiceless stops. The definition of *dialect* is needlessly restricted. The illustrative sounds listed under *guttural* are not guttural if one accepts the author's definition of the term. Much progress has been made in linguistic science since Fowler was published thirty years ago, but there is no evidence of it here.

Indications of pronunciation are scattered and often either inaccurate or more narrowly limited than in educated American usage. The author insists on [z], not [s], at the end of *blouse*, though all American dictionaries record both pronunciations, and the newer editions give the [s] first. The short *o* [ɑ] indicated for the first syllable of *corollary* is an east-coast form; the rest of the country uses *aw* [ɔ]. Despite the author, the Kentucky Derby does not contain the syllable "dare." Despite the author, the *x* of the legal term *executor* does not represent [ks] but [gz]. Entries for *khaki*, *New Orleans*, *Pall Mall* cigarettes, *root*, and *salve* are all restricted to fewer pronunciations than educated Americans habitually use; the pronunciation of *Pall Mall*

with the vowel of *father* [ɑ] is practically unknown.

In short, this is a transatlantic voyage that foundered. You cannot hope to retain "as much of the original as space allowed" and expect to produce a meaningful description of something else. It would be better to allow Fowler to remain British, as he himself would almost certainly have preferred.

C. K. Thomas
*Cornell University*

THE VOICE AND ITS DISORDERS. By Margaret Greene. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. x+224. $7.50.

While a number of books designed for the improvement of the normal voice are now available, this book is one of the first to deal at all adequately with the disordered voice. In the six chapters that comprise Part I, the mechanism of normal voice production is explained in terms of breathing, tone production, articulation, and resonance and the interrelationships among these several factors. In the additional twelve chapters that make up Part II the more common dysphonias are discussed, including disorders resulting from vocal strain and abuse, psychogenic disorders, juvenile voice, laryngeal paralyses, and neoplasms and infections of the larynx. There are two chapters on surgical procedures in the treatment of the larynx and throat, including a discussion of esophageal speech. A chapter is also devoted to "the nasal dysphonias."

Etiology, symptoms, and medical treatment of the various laryngeal conditions are explained, and appropriate vocal therapy is presented in some detail. The basic premise underlying the therapy recommendations is that the establishment of optimum conditions for voice production relieves the effects of vocal strain, prevents further damage from misuse of the voice, and enables an individual to make the most effective use of a damaged mechanism. In other words, the voice is simply helped to perform at its best through the establishment of sound vocal habits.

While the author's knowledge of the vocal mechanism and of the processes of voice production is basically sound, the critical reader can find scattered instances of misinformation, misuse of terms, and misleading explanations. For example, volume is used interchangeably with intensity, overtones and harmonics are confused, several misleading statements are made regarding resonance in general and the various resonators of the voice in particular, and portions of the explanation of the functioning of the larynx in relation to pitch changes are open to question. There is no evidence that the author is familiar with information regarding laryngeal functioning as revealed by high-speed motion pictures of the vocal folds during phonation. On the other hand, the medically oriented portions of the book are well documented from both British and American sources.

It should be made clear that the technical lapses do not detract materially from the real usefulness of the book. An otherwise sound and workable program of vocal therapy is presented, designed to improve the various vocal disorders discussed. Medial breathing is recommended and a great deal of emphasis is given to the effects and importance of controlled relaxation in voice production, both points of view with which this reviewer happens to be in agreement, although he does not share the author's enthusiasm for the importance of rhythm. At the same time, the author might have laid more stress on the importance of pitch in a program of vocal therapy and she could have been more helpful in explaining more objective and exact procedures for the determination and habituation of proper pitch level.

In all, any speech therapist should find this book a worthwhile addition to his professional library as a valuable aid in dealing with some of his most serious and worrisome problems—the vocal disorders.

Virgil A. Anderson
*Stanford University*

EDUCATIONAL GUIDANCE AND THE DEAF CHILD. Edited by A. W. G. Ewing. Washington: The Volta Bureau, 1957; pp. xii+345. $6.00.

This is a heartening book. The results of a program of research treating the educability of deaf children and the relevant procedures for effective training are summarized. The studies, continuing a significant quarter of a century of the Ewings' work at the University of Manchester, were conducted under Professor Ewing's direction during the period 1952-56, in some instances in all of the schools for the deaf in England, Wales, and the Republic of Eire.

Part I treats the pre-school deaf child, the tests that are given him, and the preparation that is made at home for his schooling. The account is, again, heartening. The evidence that suggests that the young deaf population has normal capacity for mental development and for oral communication is believable, as are

the accounts of successes among severely deafened two-to-five-year-old children with language and speech.

Part II treats the deaf child in school. Of necessity, matters of testing, of partialing out the totally deaf, the severely deaf, etc. and of sorting these according to native capacity, continue to be crucial. Increased interest, however, is given to methodology in training and to measuring the effectiveness of the training. The frequent use of *significant difference, t-test, chi square, measures of skewness and kurtosis,* etc. go far to assure the reader that here are not merely wishful evaluations, but solid substances. Large experimental samples, meticulous reporting of experimental detail, matched subgroups, and carefully documented results leave no room for "do gooder" palaver.

A few selected outcomes follow. (1) Individual hearing aids, donned by severely deaf children by the age of two years, can lead to speech: "All except four of the 27 severely deaf children were talking spontaneously after some training and seven children had begun to talk in sentences." (2) In school, a group hearing aid contributes to an improved rate of utterance, to higher intelligibility scores, and to improved reception of speech; not to higher arithmetic, silent reading, or reading vocabulary scores. (3) The students of the deaf schools are normal in emotional adjustment. (4) A principal measure of intelligence, the performance sub-scale of the Wechsler Child Intelligence Scale, yielded an approximately normal distribution of scores with no difference between boys and girls, and slight difference between day- and residential-school populations.

Workers with the deaf, the University of Manchester and its press, an English educational-medical program, and researchers everywhere can find the topics and scope of these researches and the methods and the results heartening.

JOHN W. BLACK
*The Ohio State University*

ARE YOU LISTENING? By Ralph G. Nichols and Leonard A. Stevens. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957; pp. xiv+235. $3.75.

The need for training in listening, the methods for improvement of listening skills, and the benefits to be derived from effective listening are presented in this book. The book jacket announces, "This is the first book devoted to a dynamic, new science—the science of listening. The material here is vital to management, industry, education, the professions, the salesman." Indeed, this is the first book on this phase of speech training; and it is directed primarily to management and professional persons, portions of the book having been published recently in the *Harvard Business Review*.

It is appropriate that the first book of this kind should have been written by these authors. Professor Nichols is known for his research in listening, for his scholarly writings on this subject, and for his application of his research findings in educational and industrial situations. Mr. Stevens, who was associated with Professor Nichols in studying listening at the University of Iowa, is a free-lance writer and consultant in industrial communication.

Vigorously treated in this book are the importance of listening in our society today and the lack of academic training in listening. Distinctive differences between oral and written communication are drawn. The "architecture" of oral communication is analyzed for the listener. Emotional barriers and bad habits in listening are discussed. Propaganda techniques are presented, with methods for analyzing and combating these techniques. Listening by executives and salesmen is highlighted. Listening in conference, in the family, and in school make up the final chapters.

The presentation is lively and readable throughout. Use of the first person singular, and innumerable examples and anecdotes contribute to a desirable directness and informality. References to research studies in listening in schools, colleges, and universities (notably the University of Minnesota) give substance to the issues discussed, but there is no atmosphere of ivy-covered towers here.

*Are You Listening?* is not a textbook in the usually accepted sense, but it is a useful summary of what is known today about listening and how to improve it, prepared by writers who are uniquely qualified to perform this service.

HAYDEN K. CARRUTH
*University of Michigan*

## BRIEFLY NOTED

A SHAKESPEARE COMMENTARY. By Arthur E. Baker. New York: Ungar, 1957; pp. 964. Two Volumes. $15.00.

This is a reprinting of a very useful guide to nine important dramas and six historical plays, among which are: *Julius Caesar, Macbeth, Hamlet, King Lear, King Henry the Fourth.* In addition to pertinent information concerning date of composition, publication, and source of plot, there is a detailed outline

of each play with well integrated quotations from the play text. The outline, although intended to present only skeletal information, is written in an interesting, readable fashion which exposes the reader to the flavor of Shakespearean language.

Of special interest are the scholarly, brief, and pointed notes regarding characters, place names, words, and allusions in each play. These are alphabetically arranged with act, scene, and number of line to facilitate the finding of a reference or quotation.

Each play is comprehensively covered, and the author, Arthur E. Baker, has done careful and abundant research. *A Shakespeare Commentary* is a highly recommended work for the teacher or student who needs greater confidence in the study and understanding of Shakespeare's plays. The devotee of Shakespeare will find it interesting and informative reading.

L. LAMONT OKEY
*University of Michigan*

THE COMMUNITY THEATRE AND HOW IT WORKS. By John Wray Young. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. xii+166. $3.50.

There are many books on play production, but it has been many years since a book in theatre focused attention on the central problem of integration of theatre and community. This is the chief contribution of the new book by John Wray Young—it is essentially community oriented. Advertised as a how-to-do-it book on the organization and running of a community theatre, it is far more than that. Embedded in its how-to-do-itness is a philosophy of community theatre too often misunderstood and neglected by professional and educational theatre interests. This philosophy could be read with profit by people in the professional theatre and is a must for those interested in educational theatre.

John Wray Young, currently first vice-president of AETA, is no tyro in the community theatre field. He has spent thirty years at it and speaks with authority. The entire book is effective, but I particularly liked the chapters on "Leadership in the Community Theatre," "The Director," and "How Fearless Can We Be?"

The training of directors for professional careers in community theatre has been too long neglected. This book should serve as a stimulating opening wedge. It should stand high on the required reading list for all drama students.

CLAUDE L. SHAVER
*Louisiana State University*

PLANNING AND PRODUCING THE MUSICAL SHOW. By Lehman Engel. New York: Crown Publishers, 1957; pp. 159. $3.00.

Running the gamut from "play selection" through the "final curtain," Mr. Engel has translated his vast knowledge of musical productions into a concise, stream-lined guidebook that should prove immeasurably valuable to any theatre group. The clear-cut simplicity with which he discusses the musical show gives the book a "down-to-earth" quality in which directors with limited experience can have confidence and more experienced ones can find reassurance.

In Part One the author applies to musical theatre the usual principles of play selection, anticipates various budgetary items often overlooked by community theatres, suggests sources for purchases or rentals, and categorizes information on fifty-four shows.

The second portion, "The Production Staff," is particularly well-handled. The straightforward explanation of the need for organized personnel, the vivid definition and assignment of responsibilities, the collaboration required in order to pace the show musically, handle crowd scenes, spot dancers, feature principals, shift scenery, make costume changes, execute light cues, and subordinate set pieces, makes the book ring true.

Parts Three and Four deal with procedures governing casting, rehearsing, coordinating, and presenting the show. Throughout the book comparisons of professional, semi-professional, and non-professional levels afford a broader understanding of production problems and a deeper appreciation of workable solutions.

EDNA WEST
*Northwestern State College of Louisiana*

TELEVISION PRODUCTION, THE CREATIVE TECHNIQUES AND LANGUAGE OF TV TODAY. By Harry Wayne McMahan. New York: Hastings House, 1957; pp. 231. $7.50.

The first point to recognize about this book is that it is not a "how-to" publication. The secondary title more adequately explains its function. Basically, the book is an encyclopedia of terms used in television production. The working procedures of sixteen basic operations of TV are defined in the language of the medium. Because of the book-like divisions, and because of the useful transitional paragraphs which explain the purpose of each new section and its relationship to the other

parts, *Television Production* can be read as a text. But by using the Index and the chapter headings, the book also becomes a handy reference work. Thus, we have a unique combination of text and dictionary.

*Television Production* is primarily useful for the selective pursuit of information. The author avoids ponderous and highly technical language and includes many interesting illustrations that add to the attractiveness and usefulness of his descriptions. Many sections, ranging from the basics of telecasting to advertising, may perhaps seem obvious to experienced personnel; yet those lacking a breadth of knowledge in the many related areas of TV will find the cross-explanations and applications very helpful.

On the whole, *Television Production* makes interesting reading, for one feels that this *is* the language of the industry, carefully assembled to reveal all of its component parts. It should be recommended as a reference book, in part because of its high cost as a text.

ROBERT P. CRAWFORD
*Queens College*

RHYTHM AND MEANING. By Warren Creel. Mimeographed by the author (643 Morris Street, Albany 8, New York), 1957; pp. v+120. $2.50.

This provocative book has value to the teacher of oral interpretation, to the teacher of poetry, to the poet, and to anyone concerned with the status and reading of poetry in the mid-twentieth century.

Now and then Mr. Creel seems to choose the difficult rather than the easy course, but his methods and results are always interesting and sometimes very revealing. Readers will want to compare his approach with those of Robert Hillyer (*First Principles of Verse*, 1950) and John Dolman, Jr. (*The Art of Reading Aloud*, 1956).

Mr. Creel deals principally with scansion, grouping, sound patterns, rhyme schemes, and sound sequences. Some of his most fascinating contributions have to do with opera and popular song lyrics.

Written in a rather "chatty" style and organized more for the individual reader than as a textbook, this handbook deserves wider attention than it is likely to get in its present form.

ARTHUR DORLAG
*University of Wisconsin*

A GUIDE TO THE PRONUNCIATION OF AUSTRALIAN PLACE NAMES. Compiled by the Australian Broadcasting Commission Standing Committee on Spoken English. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1957; pp. xviii+147. $3.50.

This book will be of value to those radio announcers and others who care to acquaint themselves with locally accepted pronunciations of Australian place names. Many of the names of aboriginal origin are not pronounced phonetically and have unaccountable inflection patterns. The most widely mispronounced place names and their correct local pronunciations are: Australia [ə'streiljə]; Brisbane ['brizban]; Canberra [kænbərə]; Melbourne ['melbən].

A. L. MCLEOD
*State University of New York, Fredonia*

NEBRASKA SYMPOSIUM ON MOTIVATION. Edited by Marshall R. Jones. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1957; pp. xii+130. Paper $3.00, cloth $3.50.

The findings of the seven psychologists reported in this challenging work, Volume V in a series on *Current Theory and Research in Motivation*, should disturb those who are content with the easy generalizations sometimes found in speech texts. If nothing else, textbook writers should study carefully distinctions made by Clifford T. Morgan (pp. 1-4) and Donald B. Lindsley (pp. 48-49) among terms used interchangeably: "need," "want," and "drive." Authors who have troubled themselves to provide a classification of drives will find cause for concern in Morgan's conclusion: "There is little hope of concocting a classification that provides for independent, mutually exclusive physiological drives." There are, he says, "at the physiological level alone almost as many drives as there are components of the diet or things an organism can do in a given environment" (p. 26).

The papers provoke some arresting questions: What is the role of body chemistry—"the internal environment"—in explaining human behavior? What are the implications of the hypothesis that "behind every disordered thought lies a disordered neuron" (p. 108)? If, as one of the authors concludes, "neurophysiology is rapidly elucidating some of the basic mechanisms of motivation and attention" (p. 106), what are we doing to reflect this enlightenment in our teaching?

R. G. G.

THE PROBLEM OF JOHN FORD. By H. J. Oliver. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1956; pp. vi+146. $4.00.

JOHN FORD AND THE DRAMA OF HIS TIME. By Clifford Leech. Fair Lawn, N. J.: Essential Books, 1957; pp. 144. $2.30.

The publication of these two books and the re-issue of the Mermaid edition of Ford's plays suggest a renewal of the interest that was aroused with the publication of Joan Sargeaunt's *John Ford* in 1935.

Mr. Oliver, Senior Lecturer in English in the University of Sydney, has written a critical reappraisal that must be acclaimed as a study of depth, understanding, and erudition. He presents, in a fluent and readable style, a scholarly investigation and reevaluation. The "problem" of Ford is developed in its several aspects. Mr. Oliver provides thoughtful and convincing answers to the traditional questions about Ford: What is the canon? What is the chronology of the plays? Why is there no sign, in his early writing, of Ford's dramatic ability? How was it that Ford, whose work with collaborators was slight, managed to supersede them when he wrote independently? The author also develops the idea that Ford's especial ability in the drama was his working within the confines of conventional dramatic framework while approaching the development of a psychological drama through the treatment of fine and unusual shades of emotion.

Clifford Leech, Professor of English in the University of Durham, has developed his book from a series of lectures delivered to students. It lacks the interest and value that result from more searching scholarship and literary criticism. Not entirely convincingly, the author suggests that Ford was, as revealed in his non-dramatic work, a Renaissance stoic, and that he was an apostle of the "cult of aristocracy," of the Court, and of both love and beauty. He endorses Oliver's belief that Ford's enduring value in the drama is his delineation of the emotions of his characters—especially the women characters.

A. L. McLeod
*State University of New York, Fredonia*

SHAKESPEARE BY AIR. By R. G. Howarth. Sydney: Angus and Robertson, 1957; pp. 64. $1.00.

Professor Howarth of the Department of English at the University of Cape Town is well known for his publications in Elizabethan and Restoration literature. The present volume has been prepared from a series of lectures originally delivered over the Australian radio to high-school and university students. The book is divided into two sections: Shakespearean tragedy as exemplified by *Caesar, Hamlet,* and *Macbeth;* and Shakespearean comedy, with special reference to *Love's Labour's Lost, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Merchant of Venice,* and *Twelfth Night.*

Each chapter presents a clarification of the issues involved, facilitates an understanding of the characters' motives and actions, explains the dramatist's skill, and promotes a more substantial, informed appreciation of Shakespearean drama.

Brief and lucid, the volume is to be recommended either as an introductory study or as a refreshing, stimulating restatement of ideas.

A. L. McLeod
*State University of New York, Fredonia*

## BOOKS RECEIVED

U. S. FOREIGN AID. Edited by Grant S. McClellan. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 29, No. 5. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1957; pp. 216. $2.00.

CITY AND SUBURBAN HOUSING. Edited by Poyntz Tyler. The Reference Shelf, Vol. 29, No. 6. New York: H. W. Wilson, 1957; pp. 190. $2.00.

TEEN-AGE PLAYS FOR ALL OCCASIONS: A COLLECTION OF ROYALTY-FREE ONE-ACT PLAYS. By Mildred Hark and Noel McQueen. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1957; pp. vi+465. $5.00.

HOLIDAY PLAYS FOR LITTLE PLAYERS. By Deborah Newman. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1957; pp. x+286. $4.00.

THIRTY PLAYS FOR CLASSROOM READING: A NEW APPROACH TO THE READING PROGRAM IN THE INTERMEDIATE GRADES. By Donald D. Durrell and B. Alice Crossley. Boston: Plays, Inc., 1957; pp. xviii+206.

SHAKESPEARE AT WORK, 1592-1603. By G. B. Harrison. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1958 [c. 1933]; pp. 325. Paper $1.75.

INTRODUCING SHAKESPEARE. By G. B. Harrison. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1957 (Reprint); pp. 175. Paper $.85.

THE PATTERN OF ENGLISH. By G. H. Vallins. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1957; pp. xii+168. Paper $.85.

THE SONG OF ROLAND. A New Translation by Dorothy L. Sayers. Baltimore: Penguin Books, 1957; pp. 206. Paper $.85.

STORY-TELLING FOR YOU: A HANDBOOK OF HELP FOR STORY-TELLERS EVERYWHERE. By Ruby Ethel Cundiff and Barbara Webb. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1957; pp. 103. Cloth $2.00, paper $1.00.

THE EDUCATION OF YOUNG CHILDREN. By D. E. M. Gardner. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957; pp. 118. $2.75.

THE SLOW LEARNER: SOME EDUCATIONAL PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES. By M. F. Cleugh. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957; pp. viii+186. $3.75.

VISUAL METHODS IN EDUCATION. By W. L. Sumner. (Second Edition.) New York: Philosophical Library, 1957; pp. 231. $4.75.

EXTINCT LANGUAGES. By Johannes Friedrich. New York: Philosophical Library, 1957; pp. x+182. $5.00.

LANGUAGE AND THE PURSUIT OF TRUTH. By John Wilson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1956; pp. 105. $1.75.

KEEP LISTENING. By Frances Warfield. New York: Viking Press, 1957; pp. 158. $2.95.

GUIDING LANGUAGE LEARNING. By Mildred A. Dawson and Marian Zollinger. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N. Y.: World Book, 1957; pp. x+534.

IDEAS IN PROCESS: AN ANTHOLOGY OF READINGS IN COMMUNICATION. Edited by C. Merton Babcock. New York: Harper, 1958; pp. xii+436. $4.00.

THE HARPER HANDBOOK OF COMMUNICATION SKILLS. By C. Merton Babcock. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. xiv+489. $3.50.

HOW I MASTERED MY FEAR OF PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Elmer Wheeler. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. xvi+197. $3.50.

EXPLORATIONS IN AWARENESS. By J. Samuel Bois. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. xii+212. $2.75.

BRIEF PROJECT TEXT FOR PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Clark S. Carlile. New York: Harper, 1957; pp. viii+120. Paper $1.75.

HOW TO IMPROVE YOUR MEMORY. By James D. Weinland. New York: Barnes & Noble, 1957; pp. x+149. Paper $1.00.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE, WITH SPECIAL APPLICATIONS TO HUNGARIANS. By Lois McIntosh *et al.* New York: Rinehart, 1957; pp. xviii+180. Paper $3.50.

MANUAL OF AMERICAN ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION. By Clifford H. Prator, Jr. (Revised Edition.) New York: Rinehart, 1957; pp. xxiv+151. Paper $2.75.

LOOK, LISTEN AND LIPREAD: MATERIAL FOR LIPREADING PRACTICE. Edited by Betty C. Wright. Washington, D. C.: Volta Bureau, 1957; pp. x+110.

STUDIES OF HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS IN THE LIBRARY OF THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL SOCIETY. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956; pp. 521-615. Paper $1.00.

MR. ARCULARIS: A PLAY. By Conrad Aiken. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957; pp. xii+83. $2.75.

TIME WITHOUT NUMBER. By Daniel Berrigan. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. x+53. $2.75.

THE SKY ABOVE THE ROOF. By Paul Verlaine with English translations and an Introduction by Brian Hill. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 101. $2.50.

MILTON. By Rose Macaulay. Great Lives Series. New York: Macmillan, 1958; pp. 141. $1.50.

THE BRONTES. By Irene Cooper Willis. Great Lives Series. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. 143. $1.50.

WORDSWORTH. By Peter Burra. Great Lives Series. New York: Macmillan, 1957; pp. 160. $1.50.

Robert G. Gunderson, editor of this department, has been appointed professor of speech and theatre at Indiana University, effective July 1, 1958. Professor Gunderson, who took his Ph.D. degree at the University of Wisconsin in 1949, has been a member of the faculty of Oberlin College for 20 years and has been Chairman of the Department of Speech there since 1952. *QJS* is pleased that he will continue to carry on his editorial work for us from Bloomington. We wish him well in his new position.—Ed.

# THE REGIONAL JOURNALS

Barnet Baskerville, *Guest Reviewer*

I think no introduction to this revisitation of the regional journals is necessary other than to repeat that what follows are the notes of one who has been commissioned to make a somewhat more complete and systematic survey of these publications than he ordinarily takes time for, in order to bring selected items to the attention of readers of *QJS*. Naturally, this is not a random selection; I have tried to choose on the basis of excellence. Occasionally I have taken advantage of this privilege of print to raise questions and pass judgments. I exhort no one to accept my selections as definitive or to acquiesce in my judgments. It is enough if I succeed in drawing attention to instructive or stimulating articles which might otherwise escape wide notice.

*The Southern Speech Journal*

The *Southern Speech Journal*, under the editorship first of Mr. Ehninger, and later of Mr. Getchell, continued in 1957 to publish four issues of consistently high quality. Of several articles dealing with a single speech or a small group of speeches I was most impressed by Ronald Reid's discussion of Everett's famous address on "The Character of Washington" (Spring). Reid, in a neatly conceived, well-written essay, explains the popularity of this address (it was delivered 137 times) on the basis of theme, style, delivery, and audience adaptation. He then raises the question why such an immensely popular speech should have done little to retard civil strife and create a sense of unity among the sections, as Everett clearly intended that it should do. Merely by raising such a disturbing question, this writer sets himself apart from the run-of-the-mill speech critic who might content himself with documenting the "success" of the speech by reporting the total gate receipts, the number of listeners, and a selection of fulsome press reports. (It is interesting that Everett himself thought of the speech as "successful beyond anything I ever delivered," although it failed to achieve its intended purpose.) Reid's speculations regarding the reasons for the lack of real effectiveness reveal an insight too often lacking in analyses of this kind.

Owen Peterson, in his article on "Judah P. Benjamin's Senate Speeches on Slavery and Secession" (Fall), offers a vivid sketch of the brilliant Jewish orator. But after reading this and other studies of Southern speakers by writers now living and teaching in the South, one wonders if these men consider themselves free to write as they please, or if they are subtly circumscribed by their geographical location. It is possible, of course, that Peterson is recording his own convictions, but to this Yankee it is incredible that anyone could write today of an apology for the institution of human slavery: "If Benjamin erred in his defense of slavery and secession it was in the depth of his conviction." And again, "As to the 'rightness' or truth of Benjamin's argu-

*Mr. Baskerville (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1948), Associate Professor of Speech at the University of Washington, continues the feature which he undertook first, upon the Editor's invitation, for the April 1957 issue of* QJS.

ments in the light of subsequent history, we find that each of the issues was resolved by force; so . . . it is impossible to come to a satisfactory conclusion." One reacts with considerable depth of feeling that if we cannot "come to a satisfactory conclusion" about the rightness or wrongness of a cause like this, we had better abandon hope of making a moral judgment on anything, ever.

To those who like to refer an occasional article on speech to colleagues in other disciplines on campus, I recommend W. S. Howell's speech to the N.E.A. convention on "Classical and European Traditions in Rhetoric and Speech Training" (Winter). Howell notes the gulf which has opened between scholars and rhetoricians. "It will take great educational statesmanship, he asserts, "to bring the rhetorician and the scholar together in the modern curriculum." Since rhetoric has lost her ancient partnership with learning and philosophy, a new synthesis, based on mutual respect, must be found. That respect, says Howell in his eloquent peroration,

> will ultimately rest upon the recognition that science and scholarship need rhetoric in the sense that she is the organization of knowledges governing the communication of truth to the present and to succeeding generations, while rhetoric needs scholarship and science in order to understand herself and to learn which of the competing ideologies of our time are most reasonable, most humane, and hence most worthy to be made the subject of the speaker's loyalty and dedication.

But *SSJ* is not entirely devoted to articles on rhetoric and the criticism of public address. Thespians will applaud Frank M. Whiting's gallant defense of their guild in "Are Theater People Different?" (Fall). Southerners will want to read parts three and four of the history of the Southern Speech Association prepared by the late Dallas Dickey. And nearly everyone will be interested in Francine Merritt's disinterment of *Werner's Magazine*, an obscure 19th-century journal which was once the official organ of the National Association of Elocutionists, and in whose pages Miss Merritt finds reflected the transition in this country from elocution (recitation) to oratory (original speaking).

*Central States Speech Journal*

Alone among the regional journals the *CSSJ* publishes only twice a year, but by using slightly shorter pieces, smaller print, and a two-column page, and by omitting book reviews, it manages to present about the same number of articles as does *SSJ* in four issues. In my opinion, one of the most notable of its 1957 offerings is an adaptation of Richard Murphy's introduction to the microcard edition of Chauncey Goodrich's *Select British Eloquence* (Fall). Professor Murphy describes this now rare and much coveted volume, recounts the history of its publication, introduces us to its distinguished author, and, acknowledging it as a classic, gives us some understanding of why it is so regarded. This essay will be an excellent introduction for those who have not had an opportunity to "hold the heavy book lightly in hand." Others, to whom the book is familiar, may gain a deeper appreciation of both author and work.

In the Spring issue Ernest J. Wrage packs much wisdom into his brief delineation of the qualifications of "The Ideal Critic." I quote his summary statement in the hope that it will be an inducement to read the entire article: "In the long view, the ideal critic is concerned with ventilating and improving our public talk. The ultimate justification for his existence is in-

tegrity to standards that transcend rhetoric itself."

In this same issue Robert W. Corrigan, himself a teacher in a liberal arts college, asks, "Can the Small Liberal Arts College Secure a Qualified Speech Staff?" The answer at present seems to be that it cannot. Making use of studies by Knower, Hargis, and West, Corrigan shows the discrepancy between the kind of teacher needed and the kind being provided by the graduate schools. Since the teaching of speech and drama in the great majority of smaller colleges rests in the hands of English, language, or humanities departments, the need clearly is for liberally educated speech people capable of teaching English literature and composition, directing plays, and coaching debate. But the large universities, instead of meeting this need, are preoccupied with training specialists equipped only to teach in departments similar to those in which they did their graduate work.

In my previous review, I called attention to a number of articles which sought to defend various aspects of speech training against attack or to provide a justification for their existence. During 1957 only the theater people (*i.e.*, "Are Theater People Different?" "Theatre vs. Therapy," "The Theatre Arts and the Educated Man") evinced much interest in such essays in self-justification. The entire field of speech is admirably defended, however, by Kenneth Hance in his keynote address to the CSSA convention entitled "Some Durable Satisfactions in the Teaching of Speech" (Fall). "Defended" is scarcely the word, for there is nothing defensive about this statement; it is a triumphant *affirmation* from beginning to end. Professor Hance is obviously proud to be a teacher of speech; he assumes others are too, and he speaks not as one replying to criticism but as one counting his blessings.

Having only last year accused the writers of rationales of being too much on the defensive, of protesting too much, I now demonstrate how capricious and captious a critic can be by making what may appear to be an almost complete right-about-face. As I read this article I marvel at, and am a trifle envious of, Professor Hance's undiluted optimism, his confidence, his freedom from doubts and fears. In developing his fifth "durable satisfaction," for example, (Speech is a dynamic and expanding field), he asserts that "the development of new areas and sub-areas within our field is almost a modern miracle." He then lists, proudly and without the lift of an eyebrow or a trace of despair, more than a score of these subdivisions. Here is a fresh approach to what many have decried as an alarming tendency toward fragmentation! Although I cannot wholly share its expansive sense of satisfaction, this article is a welcome antidote to the iconoclasm and self-abuse so prevalent in our writings, and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

*Western Speech*

Editor Don Geiger's experiment of turning an entire issue of *Western Speech* into a symposium on problems in acting was mentioned in our last review. Three of this year's four issues are dedicated to similar symposia. The first, on cleft palate rehabilitation, is edited by Victor Garwood and includes articles on the role of the various members of the rehabilitation team—the surgeon, dentist, psychologist, and public school therapist. The second, edited by Ernest Wrage, deals with the criticism of public address. The third, a considerably shorter symposium edited by Waldo Phelps, concerns the teaching

of speech in the primary and secondary schools. These special issues have been very well received. Donald Hargis, the present editor, reports that all copies of the cleft palate issue have been sold and all but a handful of the criticism issue. I have letters from colleagues far outside the western region indicating that they are delighted with the criticism symposium and have ordered several copies for reserve reading and for use in graduate seminars. According to the editor, nearly 200 extra copies of each of these two issues have been sold, as compared with about 25 copies of previous issues.

A touch of novelty is imparted to the Fall issue by the transcript of a sparkling convention speech by Esther Hettinger, a public school teacher from Eugene, Oregon. "Speech For All in High School?" asks Miss Hettinger in her title, and responds with a confident "of course." But since administrators are not always of the same mind, she confesses that since 1920 she has been *bootlegging* speech training into subject matter courses. She shows how it is done, and even claims certain advantages for such surreptitious schooling. Teachers in the Midwest and other enlightened areas will not understand the need for this kind of thing, but those of us who labor in states where speech teachers who are not also teachers of something else are found only at the college level, know only too well what she is talking about. The reader will infer from this article that Miss Hettinger is probably a pretty successful bootlegger who may deliver as good a product as some of the more legitimate dealers.

One other *Western Speech* innovation besides the symposium idea deserves mention. In lieu of the usual group of book reviews, this journal has been running a single critical essay reviewing several books on a common subject. Thus Ralph Richardson (Summer) assesses five beginning speech texts, Kenneth Harwood (Winter) reviews seven books on radio and television, and Thomas Nilsen (Fall) in the most ambitious of the three projects, achieves an impressive and valuable synthesis in his discussion of thirty-two books related to speech in business and industry. In view of the extensive coverage of new books in *QJS* and the inevitability of considerable duplication if all regional journals attempt a similar book review section, this seems to me a satisfactory arrangement. The result is a full-length essay which the author can proudly add to his list of publications, and which when competently done is an edifying supplement to the section in the national journal.

*Today's Speech*

Inasmuch as I was forced by what the editor of *QJS* called "the whimsicalities of mischance" to omit consideration of *Today's Speech* from the earlier review, I have diligently scrutinized all issues of this journal for both 1956 and 1957, which together contain nearly 100 articles. The variety of subjects treated, as the table of contents of even a single issue will reveal, is astonishing, ranging from substantial essays of several pages to brief bits on loudspeakers, auctioneering, conversation, and post-prandial humor. Most numerous are the "how-to-do-it" pieces, usually tips to aspiring public speakers. The reader is offered advice upon such matters as the following: "How to Make an Effective Speech," "How to Make a Bad Speech," "How to Meet Unexpected Speech Situations," "How to Think Creatively," "How to Argue With a Red-Headed Woman,"

"How To Talk Back to Somebody Who is Mad." A second type of article explains the values of speech training for physicians, dentists, naval air intelligence officers, ministers, and the like. Popular among some readers (as evidenced in letters to the editor) are the running debates which frequently develop. One man asks "Is Radio Drama a Dying Art?" to which another replies in a subsequent issue, "A Dying What?" and later the man who started it all returns with "Radio Drama Revisited."

It scarcely needs pointing out that we are dealing with a very different kind of publication from those previously discussed. Its purpose, its appeal, its tone, are different—and deliberately so. Since the announced purpose of these articles of mine is the scouting of regional journals for *QJS* readers, I must report that in my judgment, except for the excellent symposia on ghostwriting (Sept. 1956) and parliamentary procedure (Nov. 1956), and a few items of an historical or philosophical nature, most of the offerings of this journal will not be of particular interest to the audience for whom I am now writing. To say this is not to disparage *Today's Speech*. Its contributors were not writing for readers of *QJS*. If I am not mistaken, they were writing primarily for people outside the profession (notably businessmen) and for beginning students of public speaking.

According to its editor, the intent of the magazine is to present to laymen a pragmatic program of speech improvement in lively, non-technical language. The emphasis is frankly practical and utilitarian. There is, no doubt, a need for periodicals which can present rhetorical principles in simplified, popularized form in the interest of raising the general level of performance in public and private speech. There is nothing inherently ignoble about the art of popularization, and surely any attempt to relieve the woodenness and pomposity of much "scholarly" writing must be applauded. Nevertheless, certain implications of this experiment in popularization worry me.

I learn to my surprise, for example, that 60% of the copies of *Today's Speech* go to undergraduate students enrolled in speech courses, 20% to business and professional men, and 20% to teachers of speech. I learn further that the magazine is required reading in many beginning speech classes. I wonder if I am alone in feeling that how-to-do-it articles for the businessman (who has a quite understandable interest in public speaking as a tool of his trade) are one thing, and how-to-do-it articles for the college student (who is presumably in quest of a liberal education) are another. Is there not a danger that continued exposure to brief, necessarily superficial, how-to-do-it pieces may lead students (not to mention professors and administrators!) to believe that speech training in college is just what many of us have been protesting that it is not—namely, a bag of tricks, a handful of gimmicks, a catalogue of do's and dont's which might just as well be imparted extra-curricularly at a toastmasters' club?

It seems to me that I see two forces at work in the pages of the same journal. On the one hand is a striving toward academic respectability through the defense of Speech as a liberal, humane study. (As an example of this I cite Edward Thorne's excellent article on "Automation, Education and Speech," Jan. 1956.) On the other hand is the attempt to appeal to and identify with the business world, to merchandise skills and techniques which will produce practical results.

This conflict is vividly epitomized in the exchange between Edward Thorne and Charles Irvin on teaching *vs.* salesmanship. "Teaching Is Not Salesmanship," protests Thorne (Sept. 1955). Salesmanship is associated with devices to short-circuit the critical faculties. The idea that the teacher "sells himself through personality" and thereby gains acceptance for his ideas is reprehensible. When students accept ideas because of the teacher's personality, the true purpose of teaching is being subverted. "Effective Teaching *Is* Effective Salesmanship," replies Irvin (Jan. 1956). Salesmanship does *not* make use of gimmicks, lines, pitches, and angles designed to prevent objective consideration of merit. Its keynotes are sincerity, enthusiasm, and the communication of confidence. One buys insurance from a salesman or ideas from a teacher because he trusts him. Teaching is *not* salesmanship, insists Thorne (Nov. 1956). "The salesman's intent is to anticipate and prevent objections and questions that may have negative implications. The teacher's purpose is to encourage such objections and questions. The salesman aims to 'close,' the teacher to 'open'."

*Today's Speech* is of course to be commended for presenting both sides of an argument like this. But a careful examination of representative issues leaves me with the impression that one side receives more repeated and insistent representation, and the feeling that since this publication may be the only speech journal known to the students to whom it is assigned, and therefore may stand as the official spokesman for "the field," the position of the journal itself should be made unmistakably clear.

The key question, I think, is this: Can the same journal minister to both the business and academic communities? Can its articles continue to be written partly by those who are trying to justify our existence as a truly humane and liberalizing discipline, and partly by those who seem to be applying for positions as sales consultants to industry? Can a journal which circulates on college campuses plead for academic recognition for speech training while bidding simultaneously for business approval? Perhaps I overemphasize the conflict; perhaps these are not irreconcilable goals. But it is clear that one influence or the other must set the tone for the journal as a whole. My own bias is such that I should prefer the tone to be set by the teacher rather than by the salesman.

## Conclusion

This second adventure among the journals has, like the first, increased my respect (and my sympathy) for the men who edit these official organs of our regional associations. They labor under enormous difficulties. They must try four times a year to put together a balanced issue with such manuscripts as they receive. They must try to please as many as possible of their incredibly heterogeneous body of subscribers, knowing that what delights the pragmatists will grieve the pedagogues and that what absorbs college professors may be tedious to teachers in the lower grades. Perhaps we need more, or more specialized journals; perhaps readers should be reallocated on the basis of interest rather than geographical location. But under the present dispensation we readers can at least let our editors know what we like and what we dislike. And if we find what is offered to be beneath our standards, we can proceed forthwith to write something better.

# SHOP TALK

RICHARD MURPHY, *Editor*

## Bibliophilic Blues

There is some disagreement about what makes alcoholics. The WCTU consistently maintains it is the first drink. Hemingway has observed it's opening bottles that does it. But there seems to be general agreement that the first acquisition of a first edition may turn a mild bibliophile into a roaring bibliophilic.

ST well remembers his first acquisition. It was Alexander Smith's *Dreamthorp*, Ballantyne, Edinburgh, 1863, the first, the authentic edition of that much reprinted work. The first draught so went to his head that before the first bibliophilic binge was over he had five Ballantynes.

The habit grew, and before he realized what was happening, he was buying second and even fifty-second editions (Ebenezer Porter, *The Rhetorical Reader*, Andover, 1839, 52nd ed.). He became a single and then a double bibliophilic. He schemed to get more and more bookshelves, more and more books, more and more bookshelves. Then he took to piling books on chairs, on the floor, and on the desk.

All the while, his office mate, who by now had retreated to one corner, encouraged him in the vice. "Wonderful collection," he would say, "but I don't find a Rush." So in came that fifth and final edition, with Dr. Rush's nameplate. Or he would say, "As I recall when I last visited Professor Gray, he had a Joshua Steele, first." A year or so later, in came *An Essay Toward Establishing the Melody and Measure of Speech*, 1775, not the first, but the pre-first. Then one day the office mate overdid it. "I was working over your collection," he said, "and much admire that Burgh, 1800. But wouldn't it be nice to have an early Burgh?" There was something about the rhythm of the interrogation that set the bibliophilic to pondering on what had happened.

He went to *Webster's* unabridged, 1932, and let his finger run down the *biblio* columns. It was a horrifying experience. *Bibliolatristic*—idolator of books; *bibliophagic*, devourer of books; *biblioclastic*, destroyer, mutilator of books; *biblioleptic*, stealer of books; *bibliopolic*, addicted to selling books; *bibliotaphic*, hider of books, as in a tomb; *bibliophobic*, hater of books (*Webster's* happily notes this *rare*).

Fortunately about this time the janitor intervened. He had no objections to books as such, he said. In fact he had acquired parts of a college education by reading various books left in rooms by absentminded students. It was the clutter that bothered him, he said. Geologists have boxes of rocks, archaeologists boxes of bones. All this makes cleaning very difficult. To ease the situation, he had started a little club called "Acquisitors Anonymous." Each member took a pledge not to acquire anything unless absolutely essential in the conduct of his profession. ST went to meetings, and things began to clear up. He asked the office secretary to distribute his book catalogues as they came in, and never, under any circumstanes, let him see one again. He held a book auction, and brought the collection down to minimum essentials.

Unfortunately, several times a year the converted one has to venture forth into the world. Like the farmer with the woebegone expression on a Saturday evening, who, asked as to his dejection, replied, "I am going to town to get drunk and how I hate it," ST grew to dread those trips. When the most recent one was due, the family rallied round with their support. ST set out confident, head high, with encouragement ringing in his ears: "Beware the first tome"; "No more first editions until we pay the grocer"; "Stay out of the bookbars, dear father." But he was hardly across the state line when the devil seized his coattails, and he fell from grace.

It happened, of all places, in the YWCA. He was walking down a quiet street in Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, when he beheld a sign, RUMMAGE SALE. Scrawled in red crayon at the bottom, as an afterthought, was BOOKS. ST hesitated, and was lost. Into the bargain basement of the Y he went, just to browse among the ruins. An hour later there emerged from the rathskeller what was once the figure of a man, now a bibulous bibliophile, face and hands begrimed, collar awry, weaving down the street under a load too heavy for him gracefully to carry. The first tome? Dean Stanley's *Historical Memorials of Canterbury*, containing not only King Ethelbert's speech to St. Augustine on the Isle of Thanet, 597, one of the oldest extant British speeches, but also diagrams on the murder of Thomas Becket, absolutely necessary to an understanding of *Murder in the Cathedral*. And at fifty cents. Second item, *My Brother Theodore Roosevelt*, first edition, autographed by the author, Corinne Roosevelt Robinson—very nice to have in the Roosevelt centennial year. And at fifty cents. From then on, memory becomes unclear. There was Chicago, that wicked city, with its painted women luring the farm boys, and its bibliopolics beckoning to bibliophilics. The first tome was bought at Nedwick's, the first American edition of *Dreamthorp*, Boston, 1864. Such an opportunity might not rise again, and this would bring the *Dreamthorp* holdings to an even two dozen. There was the trip east, with a turnoff at the Valparaiso-Chesterton interchange, for a quick one at the Coffee Creek Bookshop (William Scott, *Lessons in Elocution*, 1st Hartford, 1795, $1.00), there was the Genesee Bookshop in Buffalo, and then Boston. At this point ST took to packaging and mailing. Then New York [Barnes and Noble, Owen Wister's *Roosevelt*, ~~first~~ edition, first issue, with the famous blooper in prologue and epilogue, To EDITH KAROW ROOSEVELT (K for C)], Pittsburgh, Akron (Old Book Shop, Bacon's *Manual of Gesture*), Indianapolis. What should be lying on the table outside the door of the Capitol Bookstore, but *Theodore Roosevelt's Letters to His Children*, first edition, one of the first hundred copies issued, containing on page three that famous error of "twenty years," for "twelve years." And at fifteen cents. A few more stops, and then home, and the janitor.

Everybody was very kind and forgiving. In fact the janitor unwrapped the last packet, *Political Debates Between Hon. Abraham Lincoln and Hon. Stephen A. Douglas, in the celebrated Campaign of 1858, in Illinois, etc.*, Columbus, Follett, Foster and Company (Macdonald's Art and Book Store, Springfield). "Very nice to have in a centennial year," he said, "but where will you put it?" He answered the question by helping to put another board on the south wall bookstack. AA called a special meeting, there was confession,

penance, and resolution. All settled down again.

But a month or so later in came a notice from Ernest Starr, 103 Washington Street, Boston 8. It read: "When you were last here you mentioned a Goodrich. Can now supply, New York, 1853, $10.00. Please advise." Here was a problem. ST tried composing answers. "Thanks very much," he would say, "but I am buying no more books." Or perhaps this would do: "You are very kind, but just spent last $2470.00 for Blackwell's 655, item 282, *Pamela*." To reinforce his resolve he pulled down William James on breaking a bad habit, and read aloud the underscored: "The second maxim is—never suffer an exception to occur till the new habit is securely rooted in your life." This steadied him somewhat, but as he replaced the book he noted what a shabby edition of the *Fundamentals* it was. He decided to sleep on the Goodrich, and did, rather restively.

The next morning he was up bright and early, took a postcard from the drawer, and wrote. It's wonderful how the words flow when you get the basic idea. "Dear friend: Bless you. Just what I need. Have 1st ('52), '54, '65, but no '53. Please wrap well to protect spine, hinges, and keep sharp eye for '61 and '87 eds."

Oh well, as ST looks back on it, it wasn't so bad. The janitor was shifted to another building, and lacking his influence, AA sort of disintegrated. And isn't that a clever story William James tells in his delightful sermon on habit, deluxe edition, about how Rip Van Winkle habitually said, as he took a forbidden slug from the jug, "I won't count this time."

---

COLLECTORS' ITEMS

Among ST's friends, the most avid bibliophile is undoubtedly Giles Wilkeson Gray (Ed., *QJS*, 1939-1941) of Louisiana State. At Convention time each year we swap notes, and have haunted the book stores at points as distant as Dawson's in Los Angeles, Nedwick's in Chicago, Starr's in Boston. ST asked the old master to tell us something about his collection, how he got started, and so on. Back came a reply by return mail. "You should know, and probably do, that a single double-spaced page is altogether too restricted a space for any, even the least avid, book collector to write about one of his hobbies, if not his principal avocation; however, enclosed is my effort."

Editor of Shop Talk:

Just when I began the fascinating hobby of book collecting I couldn't say, but it began seriously about twenty years ago when I acquired a first edition of Rush's *Philosophy of the Human Voice* from a small public library in New England for two dollars. Since that time I have bought books from Boston to San Francisco, and from New Orleans to Chicago, and points in between. The field is so large that I have narrowed my interests to two areas, speech education and elocution. Of course, they can't be separated, but despite the fact that education runs closely parallel to rhetoric in some periods and to elocution in others, I have managed to hold to the indicated lines fairly well. Now Jebb has many direct applications to education in his *Attic Orators*, and one can't separate rhetoric from education in Quintilian (my editions of that writer are Guthrie's in 1756 and Little's recent analysis).

How did I go about assembling the 250 or so items (maybe more) I have? By haunting the old book stores wherever I go, by pestering the old book dealers, by browsing down around Eighth and Ninth Streets in New York, by establishing correspondence with various booksellers here and there. Some dealers write me telling me what they have found; if the item seems good at the price asked I buy it. Others wait for me to indicate what I am looking for. Some of the former group will respond to specific requests; that is how I got the three volumes of Baldwin, my copy of Walden's *Universities of Ancient Greece*, Harhof's *Schools of Gaul*, and others. Besides, we have a pretty active old-book dealer right here in Baton Rouge.

My most prized item—frankly, I'd be

reluctant to say. It may be the copy of Rush I mentioned; it may be my 1686 copy of John Warr's translation of Quintilian's 19 major Declamations; it might be my first edition of Walker's *Elements of Elocution*. Maybe it's my set of Adams' *Lectures;* or my old first edition of Woolbert's *Fundamentals,* from which I taught "away back when" at the University of Illinois. It would be difficult to pick any one item and say it is my most prized item. *Maybe* it is my complete file of the *Quarterly Journal, Speech Monographs, Speech Teacher,* and *Southern Speech Journal.*

Just how long I shall be able to keep it up I don't know. Old books in our field seem to be getting more and more scarce, whether there are any collectors or not. Braden reports that that is also the case in England; he just returned from there. But I suspect that it will be a long time before I am able to resist the allure of an old book, especially one concerned with elocution or speech education.

GILES WILKESON GRAY
*Louisiana State University*

---

Professor Gray's report reflects wide and ranging interests. ST wanted to bring to his readers the experience of someone making an intensive collection, such as all editions of one book, or of one man. He wrote around the country. Then one day, strolling down the corridor, he saw an old friend and colleague open a safe in his office, and take from it a book. ST knew he had his man if he could sign him on. Wesley Swanson collects the works of Craig, the English master in stage production and design. In fact, it could fairly be said that Swanson is a man with a mania for Craigiania. In Craig's most recent book, *Index to the Story of My Days,* the author gives a specific detail, and says of it, "This may not interest many people but will interest my American friend Swanson." The collector was hesitant about reporting, saying, among other things, that it seemed a bit vain. ST promptly pointed out that Shop Talk is one vanity after another. Here is the report, not made in vain.

Dear Shop Talk:

The goal of my Edward Gordon Craig collection is to garner a copy of every printing of all the editions of each of the books which he has written. The earliest of these was published in 1899, strangely enough in Chicago. The latest was published in London and New York in 1957. Happily, Mr. Craig is still writing, at the age of 86.

The collection embraces something over sixty volumes. It needs seven more to become complete. Yet even now I like to presume that it is the most complete extant collection of Craig books. At least, I believe it to be considerably more extensive than the comparable holdings of any institutional or public library.

Craig books are difficult to acquire. Only three of the titles are in print. Many were issued in extremely small editions. The difficulty, however, only adds to the joy of the chase. Each addition is for me an event. I have made the long waits in between less discouraging by an attempt to substitute, whenever I am lucky, copies of more interesting provenance or association, or in finer state. So the collection seldom stays static for more than one or two months.

The lodestone of my collecting activity is a group of Craig books presented to me six years ago by the University Theatre. It was then that I began collecting seriously. I have found some of the items in bookshops. Many have been found for me by half a dozen dealers who are themselves strongly interested in Craig, and who are searching constantly for me. Particularly helpful have been two specialists in rare books, I. K. Fletcher of London and Lee Freeson of Hollywood. Both of them are experts in what the book trade now solemnly refers to as "Craigiana." Some have been gifts from friends tolerant of my fixation for Craig books. I have been generously helped by the interest shown in the collection by Mr. Craig and also by his gifted son, Edward Carrick.

What is the most prized item? The rarest consists of all five of the *Motions for Marionettes,* of which only twenty-five copies each were printed. From the standpoint of theatre interest the most valued is Adolphe Appia's copy of *On the Art of the Theatre.* From a collector's viewpoint perhaps the most interesting is the scarce *Gordon Craig's Book of Penny Toys,* in which each illustration was colored by Craig himself, and which he dedicated to his two first-born, Rosemary and Robin Craig. My copy is the one which was theirs. It is inscribed in Craig's hand: "To

my dear Rosie and Robin, from Father, December, 1899." I am also attached to a copy of the limited edition of *Henry Irving* of which only seventy-five copies were issued, each signed and numbered. Mine is copy number one. And I have a special fondness for a mint copy of the first German edition of the pamphlet *The Art of the Theatre*, which was the opening salvo in the "new movement in the theatre." It was printed in German before it was in English, and I treasure it because it reminds me that I was with Mr. Craig on the fiftieth anniversary of its publication (June, 1955).

Auxiliary to the collection is an accumulation of several hundred pieces of Craig ephemera. This includes photographs, souvenir programs, announcements and circulars concerned with his various enterprises and projects (including his youthful venture in the manufacture and sale of gilt gingerbread—although edible, it didn't sell very well), and playbills of productions in which he acted. Among the latter are those of his first season with Henry Irving and his mother, Ellen Terry, at the Royal Lyceum Theatre, as well as a dated playbill of every performance of his final season there. This miscellany is augmented by holdings relating to his mother, and to his father, Edward Godwin, and to Irving. I also have various books illustrated by Craig, but for which he did not write the text, ones for which he wrote prefaces or introductory notes (including catalogues of his exhibitions), copies of periodicals which he edited, and of ones containing contributions by him.

JOHN WESLEY SWANSON
*University of Illinois*

## NOTICE—EDITOR OF *SPEECH MONOGRAPHS*

The death of Howard Gilkinson (see memorial in this issue) has made necessary selection of a new editor of *Monographs*. President Elise Hahn has appointed Jeffery Auer (chairman), H. P. Constans, and Lester Thonssen as the nominating committee. The Administrative Council will be polled by mail. The new editor has not been named, but the June *SM* will appear as scheduled.

## INVITATION

Shop Talk hopes that the long, leisurely summer will give his reporters time to send in various items of varied interest. Deadline for the October issue is August 30. Other deadlines: October 31, December 15, February 28. Please send news to Richard Murphy, 204 Lincoln Hall, Urbana, Illinois.

### CONVENTIONS

The eighth biennial Delta Sigma Rho Congress will be held at the Kellogg Center, Michigan State University, April 10-12. The query before the house is, "What should be done to meet the challenge to education posed by today's scientific struggle?" Each school having a chapter is entitled to send four delegates. Each delegate will serve on one of the four committees, and will register as conservative or liberal for party caucuses.

Through the years Delta Sigma Rho has adhered to the idea of parliamentary debate at the congresses. There will be much meeting in smoke-filled rooms as delegates campaign for their favorite speaker, clerk, floor leader, etc. And there will be lots of lobbying to get this or that bill passed by the house. Austin J. Freeley, of John Carroll University, is director of the congress.

Michigan State will receive a DSR charter at the congress, and chapter officers will be installed.

The Central States Speech Association meeting was held during the Christmas holiday, a convenience or inconvenience made possible by SAA's meeting in August rather than the usual yuletide time. The next CSSA meeting will not come until spring, 1959 (see calendar). The executive secretary of the society has kindly supplied us with a report of the past meeting, held December 26-28, at the Sherman Hotel in Chicago.

### NOTES FROM THE CSSA CONVENTION

Some 426 program participants, officers, interested conventioneers, and creatures of habit checked in at the CSSA registration desk during the course of the convention. Among these were prospective employers from such distant states as New York, New Hampshire, Florida, and Louisiana, and NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation representatives from the entire nation. The atmosphere was that of a

sparsely populated SAA convention, attendance being only slightly larger than the April 1957 CSSA Convention in Minneapolis, and almost 100 less than the usual Chicago CSSA gathering.

Those who attended were rewarded by an excellent selection of programs and such features as the presentation of the first CSSA "Outstanding Young Teacher of Speech" Awards, which went to the following: Jack Arnold, University of Illinois, Chicago; Eugene Bristow, Indiana University; E. Fulton Ross, Davenport (Iowa) Senior High School; Charles Goetzinger, Kansas State, Manhattan; Murray Hewgill, Michigan State; Arthur Housman, St. Cloud (Minnesota) State College; Ronald Reid, Washington University, St. Louis; Elizabeth Moodie, University of Nebraska; Erwin Bitz, Grand Forks (N.D.) Public Schools; Goodwin Berquist, Ohio State; Mrs. David Tull, Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma; Donald Sikkink, South Dakota State, Brookings; and Marie Holmes, Prescott (Wisconsin) High School. Each received an engraved desk pen set, and a year's sustaining membership in CSSA. Charles L. Balcer of St. Cloud State College was chairman of the awards committee.

Although the constitutional changing of the guard will not take place until June 1, the report of the nominating committee met with unanimous support, paving the way for Edd Miller (Michigan) to assume the presidency, John H. Wiley (Nebraska) to become vice-president, and Keith Brooks (Ohio State) to take over the editorial offices of the CSSA JOURNAL. Donald K. Smith of Minnesota will become president-elect. Incidentally, the business meeting, strategically placed at 3:00 P.M. Friday, was attended by more than 50% of the conventioneers—an astounding statistic.

With this convention past, Edd Miller is laying the plans for the next meeting at the Hotel Statler, Detroit, April 10-11, 1959.

Henry L. Ewbank, Jr.
*Purdue University*

---

The SAA Christmas Chicago Convention is being planned right on schedule. Final copy for the program is due April 15. VP John E. Dietrich, in charge of the program, issued his final planning report in December. The planners have decided, he said, "that everything possible should be done to condense and streamline the convention." Three general tactics will be followed to achieve these ends: "general sessions will be eliminated; certain peripheral events will be eliminated, such as the convention breakfast and the convention social hour; the number of sectional meetings will be reduced."

## SHOP TALK SPEECH CONVENTION CALENDAR

### National

Speech Association of America: Hilton, Chicago, December 29-31; (1959: Statler, Washington, December 28-30; 1960: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30).

American Educational Theatre Association: with SAA in Chicago; (1959: with SAA in Washington; 1960: with Children's Theatre Conference in Denver, August; 1961: with CTC in New York, August).

American Forensic Association: with SAA in Chicago.

American Speech and Hearing Association: New York, November 13-15; (1959: Cleveland, November 12-14).

The Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation, National University Extension Association: with SAA in Chicago.

National Society for the Study of Communication: with SAA in Chicago.

### Regional

Eastern States: Sheraton-McAlpin, New York, April 17-19.

Southern States: Rice Hotel, Houston, March 31-April 4.

Central States: (1959: Statler, Detroit, April 10-11.)

### Related Organizations

American Association for Cleft Palate Rehabilitation: St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco, April 24-26.

American Association of University Professors: Cosmopolitan Hotel, Denver, April 25-26.

Delta Sigma Rho National Congress: Michigan State University, East Lansing, April 10-12.

Modern Language Association: New York, December 27-29.

National Dramatic Arts Conference—National Thespian Society: Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., June 16-22.

National Education Association: Cleveland, June 29-July 4.

National Council of Teachers of English: Pittsburgh: Penn-Sheraton, November 27-29.

Tau Kappa Alpha's Golden Jubilee Conference: University of Kentucky, Lexington, April 10-12.

Program Chairman Dietrich's six-page planning report is quite a document. One of the most interesting bits concerns attendance at the last convention, and number of sections at the next. It is here reproduced by the kind permission of the program planner. Two of the societies meeting with SAA are represented in the chart, the American Forensic Association and the National Society for the Study of Communication. Two other organizations, the American Educational Theatre Association, and the NUEA Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials, have separate calendars.

---

A.S.T.R. The American Society for Theatre Research held its second annual meeting in November, at the New York Public Library. The society was organized in 1956 as a branch of the International Federation for Theatre Research. It has 132 members, issues newsletters, and encourages research projects.

Membership is open to anyone interested in theatre history. Alan Downer, Princeton, is chairman of the executive committee. Paul Kozelka, Teachers College, Columbia University, is secretary-treasurer.

TIME. Members may recall receiving in December an opinion ballot on preferred time for conventions. The poll was authorized by the Administrative Council and was conducted by Owen Peterson, Executive Secretary. All members were polled; 1,225 valid ballots were returned—about 17%. The results have now been reported by the secretary. Various comparative rankings were made concerning time in relation to number of recent conventions the voters had attended. The report runs to four pages. The general findings are given below.

SUMMARY

1. August was preferred to December by the following groups:
   - All members voting (55%)
   - Members who attended the Boston convention (69%)
   - Members who have attended the last three conventions (61%)
   - Members who have attended two of the last three conventions (51%)
   - Members who have attended none of the last three conventions (65%)

ATTENDANCE ANALYSIS SHEET INCLUDING ASSIGNMENTS OF NUMBER OF MEETINGS ON 1958 PROGRAM

| Interest Group or Organization | No. of Meetings 1957[1] | Weighted Attendance 1957[2] | Weighted Attendance Ave. 1957[3] | Rank Order 1957 | Change 1957 to 1958 | No. of Meetings 1958 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Admin. Pol. & Pract. | 2 | 82 | 41 | 15 | | 2 |
| Am. Forensic Assoc. | 6 | 378 | 63 | 8 | | 6 |
| Bus. & Prof. Speak. | 2 | 90 | 45 | 13 | | 2 |
| Disc. & Group Meth. | 4 | 189 | 47 | 12 | —1 | 3 |
| Gen. Sem. & Rel. Meth. | 2 | 108 | 54 | 10 | | 2 |
| High Sch. Disc. & Deb. | 2 | 18 | 21 | 20 | —1 | 1 |
| Hist. of Sp. Educ. | 1 | 78 | 78 | 5 | +1 | 2 |
| Interpretation (2 Rd. Hrs.) | 2 | 175 | 88 | 2 | | 2+2 |
| Parliamentary Proc. | 1 | 31 | 31 | 16 | | 1 |
| Pers. & Soc. Psychology | 2 | 131 | 66 | 7 | | 2 |
| Radio-TV Film | 4 | 191 | 48 | 11 | —1 | 3 |
| Rhetoric & Public Address | 5 | 217 | 44 | 14 | —1 | 4 |
| Speech and Hearing Dis. | 4 | 364 | 91 | 1 | | 4 |
| Speech for Relig. Work | 3 | 93 | 31 | 16 | —1 | 2 |
| Sp. for Foreign & Biling. | 2 | 50 | 25 | 19 | —1 | 1 |
| Sp. in Elementary School | 2 | 166 | 83 | 3 | | 2 |
| Sp. in Secondary School | 3 | 80 | 27 | 18 | —1 | 2 |
| Undergrad. Speech | 1 | 80 | 80 | 4 | +1 | 2 |
| Voice, Phonetics, Ling. | 3 | 205 | 68 | 6 | | 3 |
| NSSC | 6 | 337 | 56 | 9 | | 6 |
| Total No. of Meetings | 57 | | | | | 52 |

(1) Sectional meetings do not include Reading Hours, Business Meetings, Interest Group Meetings, NUEA Meetings, Special Events, etc.

(2) Attendance has been weighted to reflect the apparent differences in drawing power among the three days and between the morning and afternoon periods.

(3) The average weighted attendance for the convention was 54 persons per section.

PREFERENCES ACCORDING TO RANK—ALL BALLOTS

| Date | Number Ranking Date 1st | Number Ranking Date 2nd | Number Ranking Date 3rd | Number Ranking Date 4th |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| August | 552 | 397 | 291 | 71 |
| November | 265 | 442 | 483 | 75 |
| December | 475 | 395 | 328 | 82 |
| Spring | 31 | 19 | 20 | 14 |
| Easter | 7 | 13 | 20 | 9 |
| Fall | 12 | 8 | 10 | 1 |
| Summer | 11 | 12 | 13 | 1 |

2. December was preferred to August by the following groups:
   - Members not attending the Boston convention (52%)
   - Members who have attended one of the last three conventions (51%)
3. August was preferred to November by all groups.
4. December was more popular than November with all groups except members who have attended the last three conventions.
5. In the rank-order tabulation, August received the most first place votes from the following groups:
   - All members voting.
   - Members who attended the Boston convention.
   - Members who have attended the last three conventions.
   - Members who have attended none of the last three conventions.
6. In the rank-order tabulation, December received the most first place votes from the following groups:
   - Members who did not attend the Boston convention.
   - Members who have attended two of the last three conventions.
   - Members who have attended one of the last three conventions.
7. In the rank-order tabulation, none of the groups ranked November first.

Time for the next three conventions is already set; it will be Christmas through 1960. But after that, look for an August meeting, probably on a college campus. The Committee on Time and Place makes the recommendation.

## THE INTEREST GROUPS

Under the new constitution, the interest groups were organized at the Los Angeles convention in 1955. They have been functioning two years. Some of the groups, such as Interpretation, and Rhetoric and Public Address, were well organized before the interest group idea became a part of the SAA organization. Others had their first being at the convention in '55.

With the thought that a survey of what is happening in the groups might be of general interest, and might help in the planning of the Christmas program, we began a review last fall. It turned out to be more difficult than we had expected. Some officers report they wish they knew more of what is going on in their groups. A secretary of one group reports a membership of thirty-five, but the chairman thinks there are 275 members. It seems clear that some groups are well organized and functioning, others are still in an organizational stage. Here is the best information we have been able to assemble.

Each of the interest groups is responsible for supplying programs at convention. The number of programs each group will have at Chicago is reported under CONVENTIONS in this issue. Below are reported projects under way, publications and communications, size of group. (1) is chairman, (2) is vice-chairman, (3) is secretary. The vice-chairman (2) is responsible for planning convention programs.

Administrative Policies and Practices. Convention papers have been collected, sponsored for publication, and some have been copied and distributed to the membership. The survey of salaries and policies of appointment in departments of speech, started last year (see ST, XLIII, 228), will be continued. A new survey on "The unique contribution of departments of speech to the academic curriculum" will be made. No news letter, but one badly needed, reports the secretary. 390. (1) James Henning; (2) Woffard G. Gardner; (3) John Keltner.

American Forensic Association. This group differs from others in that it is also an independent organization. Malcolm O. Sillars, secretary last year, explains the situation. Any member of SAA is entitled to belong to the group and participate in its convention programs. However, he does not receive *The Register*, quarterly publication, and bulletins unless he pays the $4.00 annual dues. A national

travel directory for debaters on tour, a directory of members, calendars of forensic events at high schools and colleges have been issued to dues-paying members. 400. (1) Robert Newman; (2) Victor M. Powell; (3) Robert O. Weiss.

Business and Professional Speaking. A survey of needs in training methods is being made. A *Bulletin* is issued three times a year. 200. (1) Harold Zelko; (2) James Holm; (3) Harold O. Haskitt, Jr.

Discussion and Group Methods. Papers in the area have been encouraged and sponsored. Three annual surveys to discover what American colleges are doing about training and research in discussion have been completed. These surveys have been directed by John Keltner, and run to thirty pages of reports. An annual research letter is issued. 265. (1) John Keltner; (2) Franklyn Haiman; (3) David K. Berlo.

General Semantics and Related Methodologies. Newsletter issued periodically. 35. (1) W. Arthur Cable; (2) Elton S. Carter; (3) William A. Conboy.

High School Discussion and Debate. The group is still in the organizational stage, and received a grant of $50.00 from SAA to help in recruiting. One membership letter has been issued. 35. (1) Ivan L. Rehn; (2) Ralph McGee; (3) Mary S. Ritter.

History of Speech Education. Issues annual newsletter. 100. (1) John T. Rickey; (2) Marceline Erickson; (3) Milton J. Wiksell.

Interpretation. The committee on bibliography has issued two lists to members. Projects include a survey of interpretation curricula, and investigation of methods to handle increased enrollment in colleges. The Tape Exchange, directed by Lawrence H. Mouat, has eighteen programs available for loan, for interchange of what schools are doing. 962. (1) L. LaMont Okey; (2) Melvin R. White; (3) Keith Brooks.

Parliamentary Procedure. Issues *The Thomas Jefferson Parliamentarian* twice a year to members. 288. (1) Wayne E. Brockriede; (2) Giles W. Gray; (3) Carl Dallinger.

Personal and Social Psychology. Issues a call and program for convention annually. 225. (1) John Black; (2) Jack Matthews; (3) David K. Berlo.

Radio-Television-Film. A survey of members, their interests, their programs of research is underway. Results will be issued in a first newsletter this spring. 100. (1) Samuel L. Becker; (2) Robert Haakenson; (3) James Lynch.

Rhetoric and Public Address. Projects: A committee system within the group; investigation of support from foundations for research in the area; a system of awards for meritorious publications. Communication is by letter, postal card, and *The Chapa Letter*, issued four times a year. 350. (1) Ernest J. Wrage; (2) Marie Hochmuth; (3) Ota Thomas Reynolds.

Speech and Hearing Disorders. (2) Dorothy Eckelmann.

Speech for Religious Workers. The group has been surveying theses in the field, and is working with the American Association of Theological Schools on a program for preministerial training. News letter issued. 175. (1) Lionel Crocker; (2) John Rudin; (3) Paul D. Brandes.

Speech for Foreign and Bilingual Students. (2) Claude L. Shaver.

Speech in the Elementary School. Issues two newsletters a year. 200. (1) Dorothy Kester; (2) James D. White; (3) Pauline Issacson.

Speech in the Secondary Schools. The group is making a course of study for high schools, and a survey of requirements for certification in all the states. Notices and announcements are issued twice a year. 174. (1) Maybelle Conger; (2) Freda Kenner; (3) Ralph Lane.

Undergraduate Speech Instruction. The group is organizing and compiling a mailing list. 151. (1) Iline Fife; (2) Robert S. Gover; (3) Elton Abernathy.

Voice, Phonetics, and Linguistics. Future project is compilation of bibliography in the area. 217. (1) Hilda Fisher; (2) Sheila G. Morrison; (3) Stanley Rutherford.

---

### Summer Plans

Margaret Robb, associate professor of speech at the University of Colorado, is acting director of the 25th Writers' Conference at Boulder, Colorado, July 21 to August 8. Colorado is also planning a first Shakespeare repertory festival in the Rocky Mountain area, from August 2 to 16. Jack Crouch, director of the University theatre, is executive director. The festival is an expansion of Colorado's fourteen-year "Shakespeare Under the Stars" tradition. Guest staff will include Hal J. Todd of Idaho State College, Gerald Kahan, Reed College, Inge Schmidt, Long Beach State College, and Jacquelyn Beyer, Montana State University. In addition to the repertory of *Hamlet*, *Julius Caesar*, and *Taming of the Shrew*, there will be lectures, concerts, a film series, and exhibits. From June

23 through July 18, Thorrel Fest will direct Colorado's High School Institute Speech Program in forensics, dramatics, and other speech activities.

The Department of Radio-Television-Film at Northwestern again this summer will offer a Symposium in Color Television in cooperation with the National Broadcasting Company, whose Chicago Station, WNBQ, was the first all-color station in the country. Network and station personnel will discuss and demonstrate principles of color television, and sessions will be held in the NBC color studios. Also in cooperation with NBC, Northwestern will present an internship program during the summer to a limited number of students. Interns will spend 30-40 hours a week at NBC, rotating through the operations divisions of programming and production. Work in beginning and advanced film production will be available during the summer. Under the direction of Jack Ellis, students will plan and prepare short films, using a variety of techniques. At the end of the summer a program showing the completed films will be presented to the public.

Michigan State University will hold its annual High School Institute from June 29 to July 25, and its annual Summer Television Workshop August 4 to August 23. A new conference and workshop in Communication Arts, designed for pastors and lay workers in churches, will be held from August 4 to August 8. Guest lecturers will include Wendell Johnson of the University of Iowa, MacKenzie Buck of the University of Florida, and Mildred Templin of the University of Minnesota Child Welfare Institute.

Kent State University is this summer inaugurating a master's degree program in General Speech embracing the areas of dramatic arts, rhetoric and public address, radio-television, and speech education. In the span of three consecutive summer sessions, a candidate may complete all requirements for either the master of arts or the master of education degree.

The Duluth branch of the University of Minnesota plans to have a nine-week summer theatre with a resident acting company. Associated with it will be a five-week drama workshop.

Visitors at USC this summer will include Allen Downer (Princeton) in drama, Burton Paulu in telecommunications, Ollie Backus (Alabama), Edward Johnson and Robert Milisen (Indiana), in pathology and audiology. Robert Harrington will teach courses carrying USC credit at the Orthopaedic Hospital Cerebral Palsy Institute.

---

THE HIGH SCHOOL QUESTIONS. The Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials of the National University Extension Association announces that the problem for the discussion and debate series for next year has now been chosen. The problem concerns American education. It is stated as follows, with alternative discussion questions and debate propositions:

Problem Area: What system of education would best serve the interests of the people of the United States?

*Discussion Problems*

1. What features of British education would best serve the interests of the people of the United States?
2. What features of French education would best serve the interests of the people of the United States?
3. What features of Russian education would best serve the interests of the people of the United States?

*Debate Propositions*

1. Resolved: That the United States should adopt the essential features of the British system of education.
2. Resolved: That the United States should adopt the essential features of the French system of education.
3. Resolved: That the United States should adopt the essential features of the Russian system of education.

Anyone interested in participating in the program should get in touch with Bower Aly, Executive Secretary, Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials, 209 Villard Hall, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

The *NUEA Manual*, the readings issued for high school debaters each year, will continue to be edited by Bower Aly, assisted by Edward Rogge of Tulane. It will be Editor Aly's 26th year. Asked about the enterprise, as to how 10,000 copies of a two-volume work, bound in about thirty different covers, can be issued over the years, Aly replied: "The whole enterprise is a typically American example of the triumph of ingenuity over adversity. Credit for it should go largely to such men as T. M. Beaird and H. G. Ingham, who founded it. Early editors were Josh Lee, then professor of speech at the University of Oklahoma, and later Senator from Oklahoma, and E. C. Buehler, University of Kansas."

Although in this edition Editor Aly will be

separated from his old publisher in Columbia, Missouri, by several thousand miles, Heath Meriwether of Artcraft Press will continue to do the printing.

---

NEW DEBATE LEAGUE. Back in 1922, when Editor Woolbert established a news and notes section in *QJS*, he observed that news about new debating, oratorical, and discussion leagues should make "good reading." It must be a long time since a new league was founded. Now here is the news, courtesy of Kenneth D. Bryson of Montana State College. In September there was founded the Great Northern Debate League. Members are University of Manitoba, Concordia College (Moorehead, Minnesota), North Dakota Agricultural College, and Montana State College.

The league will sponsor for each school one debate at home and one away, each year. A travel pool is used to balance expenses over the years. Shift of opinion ballots will be used in judging the debates. One of the purposes of the league is to foster international relations in debating. Rule 4. c, of the agreement specifies that "the host school will provide an audience of more than 17 persons."

At the organization meeting in Winnipeg, the following founders were present: University of Manitoba, Joe Wilder, Charles Anderson, Wally Christensen, Joel Slater—all students representing the debate union or the student union; Concordia, Allwin D. Monson, head of the Department of Speech, and John M. Burt, director of forensics; North Dakota Agricultural College, Gerald M. Phillips, director of forensics, and John B. Pancratz, president of the Lincoln Debate Club; Montana State, Kenneth D. Bryson, forensics adviser. Officers of the league are: president, Allwin D. Monson, Concordia; secretary, Gerald M. Phillips, N.D.A.C.; treasurer, Joe Wilder, Manitoba.

---

MAJORS. Denison University, with an enrollment of 1325, has seventy majors in speech.

---

APPOINTMENTS.

Drake University: Arthur Chassman, scene designer and technical director.

Green Mountain College, Poultney, Vermont: Alex Kemeny, head of the drama department.

Northwestern University: Robert Gay, associate professor of opera and director of the opera workshop.

Ohio State University: Walter S. Dewey, associate professor; Edward A. Andreasen, Goodwin F. Berquist, Jr., instructors.

Queens College: Doris Davis, Mrs. Constance Kuhn, lecturers.

Stanford University: Milton Valentine, professor of speech pathology, on leave from the University of Colorado; Richard Hay, instructor in design; Hall Martin, John McElhaney, Richard Sackett, Jean Wood, acting instructors; Clara Bush, Barbara Mee, Hugh Evans, Polly Fitch, Charles Dickey, James East, Philip Tilden, Byron Sigler, John Black, Edmund Chavez, Paul Harris, Barbara Cleveland, Ann Simmons, Lawrence Wismer, Robert Lehrer, Thomas Jackson, Florence Kirschner, Kenneth Waters, teaching assistants; Judith Clark, Morton Cooper, James Graham, Lucia Grove, Sheila Sacks, graduate fellows and clinicians.

Texas College of Arts and Industries: Beth Baker.

University of California: John T. Dugan, visiting associate professor in theatre arts, formerly at Catholic University in Washington, D. C. He returned in September after two years in Europe as a Fulbright Scholar and a Penfield Fellow.

University of California, Santa Barbara: Earl Owens, speech and hearing.

University of Houston: Richard Albitz, radio and television, in charge of operations of the student-operated FM radio station.

University of Maine: Carol E. Prentiss, Edward L. Tottle, instructors.

University of Minnesota: William Morgan, assistant professor, formerly head of the department at Carthage College, Illinois; Pacy Friedman, instructor.

University of Missouri: Frances Lea McCurdy, assistant professor; Harry Anglen, Clarence Brammer, William Burch, Ishmael Gardner, Barton L. Griffith, John Gow, William Hall, Bernard McCabe, Charles Row, instructors in speech; Sanford D. Gray, clinical recorder; Bill Healey, secretarial assistant, speech and hearing clinic.

University of Southern California: Paul Campbell, Lee Cranell, Joan Reynolds, Sarah Sanderson, Harold Salisbury, assistants.

University of West Virginia: Bernard B. Schlanger, associate professor of speech and director of the speech and hearing clinic, formerly at the University of Wisconsin and the Vineland, New Jersey, Training School.

PROMOTIONS. Brooklyn College: Orvin Larson, professor; Catherine Myers, James Abel, assistant professors.

---

RETIREMENT. Professor Marguerite F. Jones retired from the staff of the Department of Speech and Dramatics at Hunter College on February 1, 1958. Professor Jones had been closely identified with Hunter College for many years; she attended both the Hunter College High School and Hunter College, graduating in 1911. In 1922 she returned to Hunter as a member of the staff, having then studied at the Boston School of Expression and at Columbia University and having taught for three years at Mt. Holyoke College. She was Chairman of the Department of Speech and Dramatics from 1944 to 1953.

---

### EDWARD L. PROSS

Edward L. Pross, for the past ten years chairman of the department and professor of speech at Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas, died December 7, 1957. He became ill shortly after noon and was dead on arrival at the hospital. His family had known for several months that he had a heart condition.

Professor Pross was a native of Chillicothe, Ohio. He taught at the University of Nebraska, University of Iowa, Ohio State University, and Murray State College in Kentucky before coming to TCU in 1947.

He received his B.S. and B.A. degrees from Ohio State University, an M.A. degree in history and an M.A. degree in speech from the University of Iowa, a Ph.D. degree in history from Ohio State University, and a Ph.D. degree in speech from the University of Iowa. He was a lieutenant commander in the navy from 1943 to 1946.

Professor Pross held numerous positions in professional organizations. At the time of his death, he was Governor of the Province of Lower Mississippi in Pi Kappa Delta and was retiring president of the Texas Speech Association. He was an active member of the Southern Speech Association and Delta Sigma Rho.

Professor Pross had long been interested in all phases of speech work but his latest interests were in the fields of speech and hearing disorders. His active interest and contributions to the field of speech will long be remembered by his many friends and associates. His enthusiasm and high respect for scholarship are reflected in his many students. His high ethical standards made contributions that will have lasting effects for the cause of better speech.

Glenn R. Capp
*Baylor University*

---

### JOHN HENRY MUYSKENS

John Henry Muyskens, Associate Professor Emeritus of Phonetics in the Department of Speech, University of Michigan, died December 10, 1957, at 70 years of age. He had been a member of the faculty for 37 years. Professor Muyskens received three degrees from the University of Michigan—the Bachelor of Science in 1913, the Master of Science in 1919, and the Doctor of Science in 1925. He attended Calvin College, Grand Rapids, for three years before entering the University, and returned to Calvin to teach French and German from 1914 to 1917.

His teaching career was interrupted by World War I, during which he was engaged as a liaison interpreter for the War Work Council which coordinated American and French activities. His services were recognized by the French Government in 1919 by the award of the Medaille Militaire.

Following the war he taught phonetics for one year at the Kennedy School of Missions, Hartford Theological Seminary Foundation. In 1920 he joined the faculty of the University of Michigan where he served successively as an instructor in physiology, in French, and in phonetics. In 1931 he became Associate Professor of Phonetics in the Department of Speech and General Linguistics. He was granted Emeritus status by the Board of Regents on September 23, 1957.

His professional contributions were made in the fields of experimental and applied phonetics. In 1929 he established the laboratory for biolinguistic studies, and for many years carried on his teaching and research in the instrumental analysis of speech, utilitizing his early training in physiology, anatomy, and psychology. His interest in the biological sciences led directly to the establishment in the Medical School of the first dissection course in human anatomy taught specifically for students of speech pathology and phonetics. In 1937 he took charge of the newly established Speech Clinic of the Institute for Human Adjustment and directed its activities for several years.

A vigorous critic of classical phonetics, he based much of his work on the French experi-

mental phoneticians Rousselot and Roudet, and introduced to this country the then relatively novel techniques of palatography which they had developed. From palatographic data he evolved his theories of overlapping movements in speech articulation and his definition of the "hypha" as the physiological syllable. His broad interests and his creative intelligence frequently led him to the formulation of postulates and theories which were keenly perceptive. However, his interests and abilities did not lie in the direction of rigorous scientific proof, and thus many of his ideas still await validation.

Professor Muyskens stood six feet four inches in height, and in health weighed nearly 240 pounds. His imposing stature, his rich bass voice, his remarkable fluency in lecture and conversation, and his keen use of epigram and anecdote all contributed to his reputation as a popular teacher. He had a great warmth of personality, an intense interest in people, and a penetrating insight into their problems.

He and Professor Clarence Meader worked together for over thirty years to establish concepts of the biological bases of speech and language which they presented in 1950 in *The Handbook of Biolinguistics, Part One, Section A. Part II, General Semantics, a Guide to Better Living,* is now in the hands of the publisher.

We regret the passing of a man who inspired his associates and a host of students by the geniality and warmth of his personality and the distinctive quality of his teaching.

Harlan Bloomer
*University of Michigan*

---

### Howard Gilkinson

Professor Howard Gilkinson, 1898-1958, known to all of us as an outstanding experimentalist in Speech Education, died on February 7. He was active at his work at the University of Minnesota until the day of his death.

Professor Gilkinson was a graduate of Carleton College, where he was active in forensics. He was state orator under the late Professor I. M. Cochran. After teaching speech at Yankton College, Yankton, South Dakota, he took his Master's degree under Professor Baird at the State University of Iowa. He came to Minnesota in 1929. While an assistant in psychology, he completed his Ph.D. degree and spent the subsequent years on the Speech and Theater Arts staff. He was promoted to full professor in 1938. He was a member of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Psychological Association, and Sigma Xi.

He is well known for his two major publications, *Outlines of Research in General Speech* in 1943 and *Basic Training in Speech* in 1947 with Lester Thonssen. Besides being Associate Chairman of the Department of Speech and Theater Arts, he had charge of speech education and research. His most recent office in the Speech Association of America was that of Editor of *Speech Monographs.*

He will long be remembered for his calm and unassuming air as he investigated problems in the psychology of speech. He was able to divorce ideas from the students or colleagues who spoke or wrote them. His emotional stability qualified him to ask questions rather than to give answers. He had a keen insight into human nature—a rare sense of humor and a kindly spirit. He was loved by all who crossed his path.

Bryng Bryngelson
*University of Minnesota*

---

### Joseph F. O'Brien

Joseph F. O'Brien, Professor of Public Speaking and for thirty years coach of men's debate at the Pennsylvania State University, died on Friday, February 14. He was taken to the Centre County Hospital on Thursday with a heart attack. After convalescing from a light coronary in October, he had resumed his classes in parliamentary law beginning with the second semester. He was fifty-four on December 4.

Professor O'Brien was nationally known as a parliamentarian. His was a guiding hand in the founding and developing of the Parliamentary Procedures Interest Group of the SAA, and he edited *The Thomas Jefferson Parliamentarian,* publication of the interest group. He also served as parliamentarian to the Association. His book, *Parliamentary Law for the Layman,* had been widely adopted both as a text and as a manual. He had recently served as parliamentarian to the Alexander Hamilton Bicentennial Student Convention and the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mr. O'Brien was one of the founders of the Pennsylvania Speech Association, and for several years served as president. He had also been president of the Debating Association of Pennsylvania Colleges, the Speech Association of the Eastern States, and the Pennsylvania Speech Round Table.

He was a frequent contributor to the *QJS.* Two biographies, one of Henry F. Robert

and one of Thaddeus Stevens, had been completed in manuscript.

Mr. O'Brien was named to the Penn State faculty in 1928. Since that time he had served as coach of men's debate, directing many teams that achieved outstanding success. A man of many abilities, he had taught many different courses, but was best known in recent years for his work in American oratory, parliamentary law, discussion, and debate. He served as adviser to the Pennsylvania Debaters' Convention, which meets annually at Penn State, and as adviser to the Forensic Council. Chairman of the graduate faculty in speech, he had directed many theses.

Friends are invited to contribute to the Joseph F. O'Brien Memorial Fund, in care of the Penn State Alumni Fund. The loss of J. F. O'Brien to his many friends, to the department, and to the speech profession as a whole, will be great. To know him was to be his friend.

John K. Brilhart
*The Pennsylvania State University*

---

W. Arthur Cable

W. Arthur Cable, professor of Speech at the University of Arizona, died on January 27, 1958. He was sixty-eight years old.

Professor Cable was born on a farm in Barry County, Michigan. He was graduated from Scottsville high school, and taught in rural schools for several years. He entered Manchester College in Indiana, but left before graduation to become superintendent of schools and principal of the high school at Vandalia, Michigan, in 1913-1914. In 1914 he enrolled in the School of Education at the University of Chicago, but for financial reasons had to withdraw. He worked at the University of Chicago Press, took courses as a special student and by correspondence, and in 1920 received the Ph.B. from Chicago. Manchester College granted him an A.B. degree, accepting supplementary courses at Chicago for work uncompleted. From 1921-1923, Professor Cable was professor of public speaking at Mt. Morris College in Illinois. In 1922 he was ordained a clergyman in the Church of the Brethren. In 1925, he completed work for an M.A. degree at the University of Iowa.

That year he went to the University of Arizona. Two of his children were suffering from arthritis, and he hoped to find relief for them. Professor Cable was the speech teacher in the department of English. Under his guidance, speech was developed into a department, in which he served as head from 1934 to 1953.

Professor Cable joined SAA in 1921. Feeling the need of association in the western area, he issued a call for a meeting of speech teachers at the San Francisco State Teachers College, Thanksgiving Day, 1929. There the Western Speech Association was founded. Professor Cable served as president, 1929-1930. At the WSA Silver Anniversary, he was honored as first president at a dinner.

Professor Cable was a prolific student and writer. His range of interests extended to general semantics, public speaking, voice science, interpretation, dramatics, phonetics, and radio. He had a library of 2,000 carefully selected volumes. In 1948 he completed his work for the Ph.D. at Denver University. He edited four books and steadily contributed articles and reviews for the journals. His interests led him to genealogy. He had traced the Cable family and was writing a fictionized account tentatively titled *One Flesh*. He was active in forensics, was sponsor of the Delta Sigma Rho chapter, and served twice as president of the Pacific Forensic League.

Professor Cable's achievements were the more remarkable in that he suffered from diabetes and constantly had to guard his strength. But he carried a burden beyond that of ordinary man; when the rest of the campus was dark, his light often burned, as surrounded by his papers and his books, he worked till dawn.

Klonda Lynn
*University of Arizona*

---

EDITORIAL ETHICS. From time to time we tell some harrowing story about editorial malpractice, such as the one about how an editor neglected to open the envelope before he rejected the manuscript. In re-reading an *AAUP Bulletin* (Summer '56) the other day, we came across a very sprightly article of advice to editors, titled, "Easy Ethics for Editors." It was written by J. D. Thomas, Department of English, The Rice Institute. Part is here reprinted by courtesy and permission of the author and of the editor of the *Bulletin*:

1. When a manuscript arrives, immediately open and examine it. Then promptly acknowledge it, by title, on a postal card or (preferably) on a form sent under sealed cover.

2. If it is manifestly unsuitable, wait a decent interval of about a week before re-

turning it. (Sending back manuscripts by return mail spreads gloom and ulcers in the families of authors.)

3. If it seems to have only slight possiblity of acceptance, read it in the office; in a few days return it to the author unless by then it appears worth the attention of a referee.

4. Assign to consultants (or to associate editors having referee function) only those manuscripts that would be accepted in the event of a favorable report. If you have no room for an obviously or apparently good article, return it promptly and say so. Tell the author whether—and, if so, when—he may feel free to resubmit it for future consideration if he does not place it elsewhere. Never talk about "our present requirements," and so on, unless you really mean that the manuscript might have been used had it arrived at a more opportune time.

5. Insist that your outside readers return every manuscript, read or unread, within three months (at the longest); that they refrain from applying even the lightest pencil mark to it, but instead make their report to you in letter form; and that so far as possible they keep the manuscript in the same condition in which they received it (without, for example, additional folds or marks of paper clips—common stigmata of a widely traveled article).

6. On receipt of a favorable report, determine at once as closely as possible the schedule of publication, and notify the author. Try to give your notification a cordial tone; remember, the acceptance probably is a much bigger event in his life than in yours. Let him know the rate of payment or how many copies he will receive, and what arrangements for reprints are possible. If the manuscript needs revision, tell him precisely what you expect and set a firm deadline for the new copy.

7. When the reader's report is unfavorable or neutral, make up your own mind quickly. Don't keep the manuscript around for another year or two, in vague expectation that it will age gracefully or that a famine of contributions may open a place for it.

8. Finally, in your editorial policies and your relations with authors, always bear in mind that the power of decision inherent in your function incurs an obligation above private prejudice. One of my most wonderful authorial possessions is an editor's penciled scrawl on the face sheet of a manuscript concerning the centenary of Oscar Wilde's birth, fired back at me across the ocean with celerity. The gloss is brief, clear, and definitive: "Never will I willingly print anything about O. W.—Ed. *N. & Q.*"

---

### Postscriptum on Rejections

I would suggest that an editor compose the copy for his rejection slips some morning after a pleasant night's repose. "We thank you for letting us see the enclosed material, but regret . . ." does not take much more ink than the bald statement: "We cannot use the enclosed material," and the former will be consciously or unconsciously appreciated by even a rejection-hardened writer.

Individually composed notes are not necessarily better than rejection slips. Authors, being perceptive people, would rather have a courteous printed slip (where there can be, of course, no question of sincerity or insincerity) than even the faintest tinge of irony or brush-off in a personal message. In my opinion, the review type of rejection letter (". . . but we think you would have done better to . . . ," etc.) seldom does any good; for better or worse, the author has written what he has been able to write, and he probably does not intend to start over. The best rejection note usually is brief and says pretty much the same as a good printed slip; though with direct reference to the particular manuscript. Recommendation of another journal is almost always officious—except in those extremely rare situations where the editor is able to suggest a little-known specialized medium that even a well-informed author might overlook.

---

BRITISH MUSEUM CATALOGUE. You just don't walk into the reading room of the British Museum. You have to be certified. References and declarations about kind of research intended are presented, and only after it has been established that your needs cannot be met elsewhere are you admitted to that select company which once included Karl Marx. Once in, you look for the usual oak cabinets with the 3 x 5 catalogue cards. But there aren't any. And then you recall that the library catalogue as we know it is an American phenomenon. Instead, around the wall there are rows of books re-

sembling scrap-books. They are big and heavy, with a rope attached to the top of the spine. You tug on the rope, brace yourself for the fall of the volume, and then stagger to the nearest table. When you open the volume you discover it *is* a scrap book. It is part of the old printed catalogue of 1881—1905, pasted on sheets, with later printed cut-outs pasted in. The catalogue goes on book after book; there were 1,018 volumes around the walls when I last counted, but that was back in 1931.

That same year, strolling through the local college library, I came upon a large volume bound in red buckram, titled *British Museum —General Catalogue of Printed Works*. It was volume 1 of a wonderful venture, a new and complete catalogue of British Museum holdings. The first volume ran from *A* to *Aeg*, and it seemed clear the whole would require more than a five foot shelf. The volumes came along, slowly but surely, and three or four times a year I drifted past the collection to see how it was coming along. The particular volume I was awaiting would be *Smi*, well down the line, and with patience I continued my inventory through 23 years. In 1954, vol. 51 appeared. The last entry was: *Deswarte (Aimé)-De l'influence de l'abus des alcooliques sur la march et le traitement des maladies aiguës. Pp. 30. Paris, 1860.* And then no more. When, oh when, would *Smi* appear?

An announcement from W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., Cambridge, explains all. What it seems to mean is that you will be able to have the old catalogue in your library, reduced to 300 volumes, no pull ropes necessary, within the next six years. The announcement doesn't say when *Smi* will appear, but it should be around 1963. Here are the details:

> The Trustees of the British Museum have reluctantly decided that they are unable to continue publication of the revised edition of the General Catalogue of Printed Books which was begun in 1929 and has now reached its 51st volume (—DEZWARTE). Owing to the war and its consequences the whole programme of publication has fallen so far behind that its fulfilment is no longer practicable.
>
> It is proposed however to produce by means of photo-offset lithography a complete new edition of the working catalogue now in use in the Reading Room of the British Museum.
>
> The adoption of this modern Technique of printing will make it possible to complete publication of the estimated 300 volumes in the relatively short time of six years, for the process is almost entirely mechanical and cuts out most of the production work such as type-setting, proof-reading, etc. By its means the complicated operation of transforming the reading room Catalogue into a new edition can be carried out speedily and with precision.
>
> The value of the British Museum Catalogue has been proved over and over again since it was first printed in the 19th century. It is indisputably the best general existing guide to the works of the largest numbers of authors of all periods and of all countries, and it is invaluable as a source of bibliographical information of the very highest authority. This new edition will contain about five million entries, more than twice as many as the original edition. Statistical comparisons with the recently published catalogue of the Library of Congress demonstrate the continued need for and special value of the proposed new edition. The British Museum Catalogue is seen to be much more complete for English authors and contains twice as many foreign authors as the American Catalogue, as might have been expected; but the most striking difference lies in the field of earlier books. Of books printed before 1800, 95% appear only in the British Museum.
>
> The new Catalogue will be produced at the rate of about 50 volumes a year, the aim being to complete the whole work in about 300 volumes over some six years. Publication will begin early in 1958. Specimen papers and prospectuses are available.
>
> The price of the Catalogue will depend directly on the number of subscribers. With the minimum number justifying publication the price is likely to be about £8 ($22.40) per volume. Subscriptions at approximately £400 pa., excluding packing and carriage, would be payable annually in advance.
>
> Prospective subscribers to this important new undertaking are requested to write to us, without commitment, as soon as possible so that they may be included in the preliminary lists. Statements of the exact terms of subscription, together with the formal invitation to subscribe, will be issued later.

---

RARE BOOKS. The University of Miami Press will publish a Rare Books of the Theatre

Series jointly with the American Educational Theatre Association. Barnard Hewitt, of the University of Illinois, is general editor of the series for the American Educational Theatre Association.

One volume is to be published each year containing materials either at present out of print or available only in a foreign language. The first volume, which is planned for 1958, will contain the principal sources of information about Renaissance Italian theatre and stage scenery: translations from the writings of Sebastiano Serlio, Nicola Sabbattini, and Josef Furttenbach by Allardyce Nicoll of the University of Birmingham, John McDowell of Ohio State University, and George R. Kernodle of the University of Arkansas.

---

BIBLIOGRAPHY. The Department of Speech, University of Michigan, has issued *Speech Bibliography*, pp. 101. It "has been assembled," says the preface, "to aid the Speech student . . . in his study in various areas of Speech." Listings are made under public address, oral interpretation, theatre, radio and television, speech and hearing therapy, and speech science. Professor William M. Sattler was chief compiler. Copies are available at the Publications Distribution Service, 412 Maynard Street, Ann Arbor, at $2.00.

The department has also printed a list of all persons who have received graduate degrees in speech from the University. The first M.A. was awarded in 1918; in 1957, 37 M.A.'s were given. The first Ph.D. was issued in 1932; in 1957, two Ph.D.'s were given, but it was a light year, seven having been issued in 1956. Professor Sattler also compiled the record.

---

NEW EDITORS. *The Central States Speech Journal* takes on a new editor June 1. Kim Giffin (Kansas) retires in favor of Keith Brooks of Ohio State.

Barnet Baskerville, University of Washington, is now editor of *The Chapa Letter*, publication of the rhetoric and public address interest group.

---

ELEMENTARY. G. & C. Merriam's *Word Study* (Feb. '58) has a very interesting little article, "The Noah Webster Bicentennial, 1758-1958." Details: in 1820 Webster stood on the cornerstone of Amherst's first buildng, for which he had helped raise the money, and gave a short dedication address; he conducted a campaign to get a copyright act, once spending thirteen months away from home, traveling by coach and horseback; the first Merriam *Webster's* was printed in 1847, and was edited by Chauncey A. Goodrich, Webster's son-in-law, and editor of *Select British Eloquence;* Webster's "Blue-Backed Speller," *The Elementary Spellingbook*, sold 70,000,000 copies.

---

BOOKS WE NEVER GOT AROUND TO ORDERING. Into the office, daily come two or three book catalogues, from Oxford or Geneva, New York or Rome. It is pleasant to scan and distribute them to interested colleagues, to the library, to graduate students who should be cultivating an affection for books and for book catalogues. An even greater pleasure comes in ordering an item, long wanted, and at last possibly procurable at possible price. The wait—and then comes the packet, or a card regretting item was sold to another; esteemed customer will be kept in mind should another such copy be located.

While dusting a pile of *Congressional Records* in spring house cleaning the other day, we discovered a collection of book catalogues marked affectionately, but from which for one reason or another, probably mere neglect, nothing had been ordered. Some of the items marked were these:

Austin (Gilbert). *Chironomia; or a Treatise on Rhetorical Delivery, etc.* With 12 plates, depicting well over 100 figures. 583 pp. London, 1806. Extremely scarce. $32.50. A & B Booksellers, New York. Catalog AB557, item 27.

Dickens (Charles). *Works.* 23 vols.-Nonesuch Dickensiana. Retrospectus and Prospectus; together 24 vols., 800 illustrations, carefully printed from the original plates and blocks; buckram, leather labels, gilt tops. 1937-1938. The finest of all editions of Dickens. Indeed, Mr. Arthur Waugh has stated, "It will never be possible for a more complete and perfect edition to be put on the market." Only 877 sets were issued, a limitation imposed by the number of original plates and blocks, one being issued with each set. Two volumes are damp stained on the lower covers; otherwise a remarkably fine and fresh set having been carefully preserved in the dust-wrappers since publication. $336.00. Heffer, Cambridge. List 702, item 1315.

Donne (John). *LXXX Sermons*, first edition, with engraved frontispiece containing portraits (in later state), folio, contemporary calf, rebacked, tear in leaf El and wanting the first and last blank leaves. Printed for Richard

Royston and Richard Marriot, 1640. $98.00. Thomas Thorp, London, List 312, item 46.

Literary Curiosity. *A Sermon in Words of One Syllable Only*. Manchester, 1871. Stitched. $1.05. David Low, London. List 103, item 331.

Mason (John). *Essays on Poetical and Prosaic Numbers, and Elocution*. 2nd Lond. ed., 1761. $42.50. Sigmund Weiss, New York. Seventh Speech Sale List, item 250.

Milton (J.). *Areopagitica. A Speech. . . .* Sm 4to vellum. Fine copy. Only 300 copies printed. 1907. Doves Press. $33.60. Heffer, *op. cit.*, item 800.

[Roosevelt, Franklin D.]. Riddle (George), ed. *A Modern Speaker and Reader*. 12mo, orig. cloth, g.t., uncut, Chicago, 1901. Roosevelt's own copy of the book from which he studied public speaking at Harvard. It is no exaggeration to say that this book was a dominant influence on two facets of his later career—public speaking and political thought. It contains over 330 words of his scribbled comment on members of his class, including this on himself, "F.D.R. Not enough life. Needed more ruggedness. Too much. Don't bow. Forward foot too far. Get horizontal gestures on double." He also scored various passages in the text, including a very significant one in Theodore Roosevelt's *The Use and Abuse of Property*. $650.00. Howard S. Mott, Inc., New York. List 160, item 174.

Speeches. *A Collection of Speeches of 19th Century Statesmen*. 72 vols., 1806-1883, 8vo, bound in full calf, contrasting letterpieces, some vols. a little rubbed and front covers of 4 vols. loose. $98.00. Blackwell's, Oxford. List 655, item 438.

---

GRANTS IN AID. If one wants a mouth-watering experience, in a fiscal sort of way, he should read the reports of some of our foundations. *The Rockefeller Foundation Annual Report* for 1956 accounts for $30,075,305.00. Only one appropriation went to a speech activity. Philippine Normal College, Manila, received 17,250 Philippine pesos and $11,950 (about $20,700) for development of the drama program. Other specimen grants were:

Modern Language Association of America, New York: preparation of materials for teaching modern languages at the college level; $40,500.

University of Chicago, Illinois: preparation for publication of the papers of James Madison; $150,000.

American Historical Association, Washington, D.C.: preparation of a new edition of the *Guide to Historical Literature;* $75,000.

American Shakespeare Festival Theatre and Academy, Inc., Stratford, Connecticut: general support; $100,000.

Foundation for Cultural Projects, Inc., New York: fellowships in creative writing and criticism to be awarded by the editors of the *Partisan Review;* $52,200.

The Hudson Review, Inc., New York: fellowships in creative writing and criticism to be awarded by the editors of *The Hudson Review;* $52,200.

Canada Foundation, Ottawa: fellowships in creative writing and criticism; C$48,300 (about $49,570).

San Francisco State College, California: development of the Poetry Center; $11,500.

Korean Language Society, Seoul: publication of a six-volume dictionary of the Korean language; $36,400.

University of Colorado, Boulder: support of the honors program of the College of Arts and Sciences; $28,000.

Institute of International Education, New York: support of the international student exchange program; $250,000.

Maybe SAA needs a committee for fudging funds from foundations.

---

FOUNDATION REPORT. Pressley C. McCoy, assistant director, The Danforth Foundation, 835 South Eighth Street, St. Louis 2, has prepared a report and given us permission to use parts of it. Who is eligible, how much you can get, and other pertinent details are reported below:

> One of the major problems facing many teachers in our colleges and universities is that of finding the financial means for completing their doctoral degrees. Since 1954, 169 teachers (ten of whom are in the field of Speech) have found the solution to this program through the Danforth Teacher Study Grant Program. This Fellowship, one of numerous programs offered by The Foundation, was formulated with the intention of raising the quality of teaching in our institutions of higher learning. From fifty to seventy grants are made each year to men and women, without bar of race or color, who give promise of becoming college teachers of unusual strength and competence, and are prepared to engage upon a twelve-month program of graduate study.

Each year The Foundation invites all accredited colleges within the U.S.A. to nominate one or more teachers for these Study Grants. (Institutions with a student body up to 2000 are invited to nominate one teacher; institutions with a student body between 2000 and 4000 are invited to nominate two teachers; institutions with a student body in excess of 4000 are invited to make three nominations.)

To be eligible, a teacher must be between the ages of 25 and 40, have had at least one year of successful graduate study, and three years of teaching experience (two of which must have been on the college level). Those receiving the grants are chosen on the basis of potential excellence as teachers, outstanding academic ability, personality congenial to the classroom, and integrity and character, including serious inquiry within the Judaeo-Christian tradition. Applicants with deep rootage in some non-Christian faith, and willing to participate actively in a predominantly Christian program, are given equal consideration.

These appointments will allow the Danforth Teacher one-half his salary for the academic year (usually 9½ months), plus one-sixth of his salary for each dependent listed in his latest tax return, up to a total of his full salary, or not exceeding $4,600.00. The minimum grant is $2,100.00. In addition, the Danforth Teacher is given tuition and official fees at the graduate school of his choice.

One of the unique features of this Program is the Conference of Danforth Teachers and their wives (or husbands) held for one week in August at Camp Miniwanca, Michigan, prior to the year of graduate study.

---

WHAT'S AVAILABLE? We have received requests for a report on fellowships, awards, etc. which would make it possible for teachers to take some time off for study and research. If ST can tap someone to do the job, we shall have an inventory with special reference to speech. Anxious to be of some use now, however, we stopped in to see the dean of the graduate college. He had on his desk three works which would be helpful to anyone inquiring into graduate grants:

*World-Wide Graduate Award Directory* was published in 1957 by The Advancement and Placement Institute, Box 99, Greenpoint Station, Brooklyn 22. $2.00. Information about grants available at 350 universities and foundations in 45 states and 30 foreign countries is given. Listings are mainly for universities. The little booklet, 28 pp., is just the beginning. A supplement will be issued this year. The Institute also issues a *Summer Placement Directory*, listing summer jobs for teachers and students, at the same price. The 1958 edition contains a new section on summer jobs in trainee programs in business, government, science, and recreation—the learn-while-you-earn idea.

*Directory of Fellowships in the Arts and Sciences*, 1957, is issued by The Association of American Colleges. Copies can be procured from Directory of Fellowships, Room 79, Biochemistry Building, University of Wisconsin, Madison 6. There is general information on university fellowships, detailed description of foundation grants such as those from Danforth and Ford, and some listings of opportunities abroad. Forms for letters of application, addresses of where to send them, etc. are provided.

*Study Abroad, International Handbook—Fellowships, Scholarships, Educational Exchange*, 9th edition, 1957-1958, is issued by UNESCO. It's a big book, 836 pp., and lists 75,000 individual opportunities for obtaining financial assistance for international educational travel. International in tone, printed in Paris, there is detailed listing of opportunities in the United States.

---

SPEECH SCHOLARSHIPS. The University of South Dakota announces two $500 scholarships for senior students in speech correction, who will accept employment in South Dakota upon graduation. The awards are given by the South Dakota Society for Crippled Children. Address James F. Kavanagh, Speech and Hearing Clinic.

The Stanford Division of Speech Pathology and Audiology, under a grant from the National Polio Foundation, has three graduate students working as internes at Fairmount Hospital in San Leandro. These students are speech therapists, who work with post-polio cases, with especial emphasis on the rehabilitation of adult aphasics.

---

TROPHIES. Four Sproul Speech Trophies, in honor of Robert Gordon Sproul, president of the University of California, are now being awarded annually, one each on the Berkeley, Los Angeles, Riverside, and Santa Barbara

campuses of the state university. Winners are selected by school competition and receive a scroll or cup.

---

NEW SAA VOLUME. Here is how things appear in regard to the projected volume of *Studies in Colonial Public Address*. Editor George V. Bohman of Wayne State University has kindly supplied us with a preview. All of the studies have been assigned, and some of the first drafts are in. As it looks now, the table of contents will read:

1. *Introduction* ..... George V. Bohman
2. *Puritan and Church of England Preaching in the Seventeenth Century* (to about 1720) ..... Orville Hitchcock
3. *Revivalist Preaching in the Eighteenth Century* ..... Eugene White
4. *The New England Town Meeting* ..... David Potter
5. *Courtroom Speaking* ..... Merrill T. Baker
6. *The Colonial General Assemblies* Gale Richards
7. *Public Address as Propaganda* Gordon Thomas
8. *The Continental Congresses* ..... George V. Bohman
9. *Commemorative Speaking* Howard Martin
10. *Public Address at the end of the Revolution* ..... Bower Aly

---

NEUE FESTSCHRIFT. *The Rhetorical Idiom—Essays in Rhetoric, Oratory, Language, and Drama* was published by Cornell University Press in February. It contains seventeen essays by students and colleagues of Herbert August Wichelns, and is presented to him with their respects. An informal presentation occurred at a dinner in Ithaca, March 15. The formal festivities of the festschrift will come at the Cornell luncheon at the Chicago convention in December.

The idea of a volume in Professor Wichelns' honor was sponsored originally by a group of his students. It was carried to completion by Donald C. Bryant, who collected the essays, edited them, and saw them through various stages to publication. Contributors to the volume, other friends, and a grant from the Hull Memorial Publication Fund of Cornell University financed the volume. It will be reviewed in *QJS* next December.

This is the third volume of "in honor" studies in rhetoric and drama by the Cornell group. *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James Albert Winans* was published in 1925, and is now a collector's item. In 1944 was published *Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond*.

There is no particular occasion for the Wichelns volume—the honored one is still on the job—just general esteem and appreciation.

---

PERSONALS

Earl W. Wiley, who retired from Ohio State last year, taught the fall semester at The College of Wooster, and this spring term is teaching at State University Teachers College, New Paltz, New York. He was recently appointed by Governor O'Neill to be chairman of the Ohio Abraham Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission. The sesquicentennial comes in 1959.

A. Craig Baird, who retired from Iowa in 1952 but still teaches each first term there, is again at the University of Missouri second term. He is teaching courses in discussion and debate and in the philosophical foundations of speech.

Subert Turbyfill, director of speech and drama in the Canal Zone Junior College, Panama Canal, was the keynote speaker at the national convention of Phi Theta Kappa in Brevard, North Carolina.

David C. Phillips, University of Connecticut, has been appointed director of a new American Management Association course in effective speaking for managers. Institutes are held at the association's new academy in Saranac Lake.

Loren Reid, Missouri, was guest lecturer at the School of Dramatic Art and Speech, Ohio University in January.

Everett Hunt of Swarthmore (ed. *QJS*, 1927-1929), was the January lecturer in the Oreon E. Scott Foundation series at Washington University. Besides his lecture on "Rhetoric and Criticism," he held two seminars, one on "Isocrates," the other on "A Rhetorical Approach to Milton and Shakespeare," met with students, hobnobbed with the faculty, and gave a recital of songs from Shakespeare for the assembled Shakespeare classes and the early morning public.

Marie Hochmuth is now ensconced at 64 Bedford Court Mansions, Bedford Avenue, London, W.C., 1, care Glynn. About her residence, she explains that *mansions* over there means *many* not *much*, and that she is within walking distance of the British Museum. She will return to Illinois in the fall.

Barton L. Griffith, formerly on the staff of

the Educational Television and Radio Center at Ann Arbor, is in charge of courses in television and radio at the University of Missouri.

Lucy Barton, author of books on costume, was given an award at the annual Southwest Theatre Conference, held at the University of Texas, "for incomparable service to the visual eloquence of the theatre."

Rachel Smart, Kendall College speech teacher, reigned as Evanston's Auto Show Queen at the Golden Jubilee Chicago Auto Show in January.

Thorrel Fest and Victor Harnack, University of Colorado, are serving as consultants for the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services.

Harry V. Jaffa, Ohio State department of political science, led several seminars about Lincoln, in the department of public speaking at Northwestern, in February. In commemoration of the centennial of the great debates, one of the seminars was devoted to "Crisis of the House Divided: An Interpretation of the Lincoln-Douglas Debates."

"Curtain Going Up" radio show, produced by Don Buell (Michigan State) on Michigan stations for twenty years, is now being programmed by the National Association of Educational Broadcasters over forty stations. The show deals with current Broadway theatre.

David Ralph of Michigan State was chairman of a Conference on New Research Methods in Traffic Safety, held at Williamsburg, Virginia, in February. The conference was called by the President's Committee on Traffic Safety.

Melvin R. White of the Brooklyn College theatre continues his lectures to off-campus groups, which he began on a grand scale in 1952. His lecture tours have taken him across the country and to Hawaii. His current lectures are on: "Current Plays on and off Broadway," "Shakespeare on and off Broadway," "Trends in the American Theatre."

---

### Theatre Schedules

Alfred State Agricultural and Technical Institute: *Male Animal, The Miser, The Orestia-Agamemnon, Electra, Eumendides* (abridged), *Mourning Becomes Electra, Macbeth.*

Brooklyn College: *The Cherry Orchard, Picot,* an all-college musical. Brooklyn Community Children's Theatre: *Emperor's New Clothes, Amahl and the Night Visitors, The Wonderful Well, The Wizard of Oz, Beauty and the Beast, Clownface, Rumpelstiltskin.*

Drake University: *Witness for the Prosecution, The Desk Set, Much Ado About Nothing, Hotel Universe, The Skin of Our Teeth.*

Green Mountain College: *The Young and the Fair.*

Grinnell College: *Dr. Faustus.*

Iowa State College: *The Remarkable Mr. Pennypacker, Dr. Knock, Ladies of the Jury, School for Scandal.*

Maryville College: *Loyalties.*

Memphis State University: *Bus Stop.*

Michigan State University: *The Tender Trap, True Love and Spaghetti* (an original play in commedia dell' arte style).

Ohio State University: *Private Lives, Winterset, A Midsummer Night's Dream, The Adding Machine, Guys and Dolls.*

Southwestern Louisiana Institute: *Medea,* a dramatic reading; *Lo and Behold.*

Stanford University: *Tiger at the Gates, Magic in the Sky, He Who Gets Slapped, A Midsummer Night's Dream,* an original musical revue.

Teachers College of Connecticut: *My Heart's in the Highlands, The Potting Shed, Great God Brown.*

Texas College of Arts and Industries: *Hamlet, The Hasty Heart, The Second Shepherds' Play.*

University of Akron: *The Reluctant Debutante, The Playboy of the Western World, The Bad Seed, Everyman.*

University of Delaware: *The Tender Trap* will tour the Pacific Command from April 12 to June 6, visiting bases in Hawaii, Japan, Korea, and possibly Okinawa and the Philippines. A special educational program concerning life and culture in the East has been worked out for the 11 students comprising the cast. Campus productions include: *Red Shoes, The Crucible, The Plough and the Stars, The Desk Set, The Runaway Rocket, Love for Love.*

University of Houston: *The Desperate Hours, Is Life Worth Living,* in cooperation with the music department; *Amahl and the Night Visitors, Dr. Knock, Volpone, The Medium* and *The Telephone, Othello.*

University of Illinois, Chicago: *The Heiress.*

University of Minnesota, Duluth: *Desire Under the Elms, Uncle Vanya, The Flowering Peach, Calvaria,* an opera composed by Addison Alspach of the faculty, *The Seven Year Itch.*

University of North Carolina: *The Lark, Teahouse of the August Moon, What Every Woman Knows, A View from the Bridge, The Comedy of Errors.* For the Southeastern Theatre Conference in Chapel Hill on March 27, 28, 29, the Playmakers presented *Out of the South,* a program of eight one-act plays by Paul Green, in celebration of the Playmakers' 40th anniversary.

University of Oregon: *The Teahouse of the August Moon, Hedda Gabler, Tiger at the Gates, I Have Been Here Before, The Short Hour*—a premiere production, *The Way of the World, Annabelle Broom* by Children's Theatre, *A Mirror for the Sky,* premiere production of an American opera.

Wayne State University: Under the auspices of the President's Special International Program for Cultural Presentations, which is administered by the American National Theatre Association, thirteen students accompanied by Leonard Leone and Mr. and Mrs. Richard D. Spear are touring India for the United States Department of State. The cast presents: *Beyond the Horizon, Oedipus Rex,* and a group of one-acts.

West Virginia University: *The Lark, The Corn is Green, The Teahouse of the August Moon, Picnic.*

---

RADIO, TV, FILMS. Two new educational TV courses, one on art appreciation and the other on guidance of young people, are being produced live in the studios of the Indiana University Radio and Television Service, WTTV.

Don Meier and Paul Robinson, network directors at NBC, Chicago, have been appointed to teach jointly the class in advanced television direction at Northwestern University. Mr. Meier is known for his work on NBC's *Zoo Parade* and Mr. Robinson has worked extensively on NBC's *Tonight* program.

Northwestern University featured a ten-week movie-lecture series this winter. Thirty-one films from seven countries traced the development of the motion picture as an art form from 1895 to the present. Jack Ellis explained the significance of each film.

The Film Society, University of Illinois, will show *Lilac Time,* 1928 sound movie, May 22. Colleen Moore, star of the show, will appear to tell about it. Miss Moore is now the wife of Homer P. Hargrave, a Chicago broker. Henry L. Mueller is faculty adviser of the society. Professor Mueller's course, "Appreciation and Criticism of the Motion Picture," features eight famous films, such as *Birth of a Nation, The Great Train Robbery,* Sarah Bernhardt's *Queen Elizabeth,* and a group of five Chaplin films. Although emphasis is on appreciation, students are permitted to make a film in lieu of a term paper. So far one animated film in color has been done, and several story films and documentaries.

---

TR AS BIBLIOPHILE. In this, the Theodore Roosevelt centennial year, one might recall that he was a bookish man. He was so busy pioneering in the Dakotas, leading the Rough Riders, busting trusts at home, and shooting lions abroad, one is apt to forget that he was essentially an egghead. As President he found time to write book reviews for *The Atlantic* and to provide a sinecure in the customs office for the poet, Edwin Arlington Robinson. Had TR not achieved fame as a statesman, he would be remembered as an author. The definitive edition of his general works (Scribner's, 1927) runs to twenty volumes; the definitive edition of his letters (Harvard University Press, 1951-1954) goes to eight volumes. There are about twenty-five volumes of collected speeches, although no definitive edition has ever been made; collecting the speeches would require a foundation grant of some size.

A visit to TR's old home at Sagamore Hill, Oyster Bay, Long Island, opened to the public in 1953, will confirm the assertion that he loved books. At first glance, the visitor is impressed by elephant tusks and heads various—giraffe, buffalo, Rocky Mountain sheep, rhinoceri. But as one prowls around, he discovers books and books and books. Between the bedroom door jambs there are four or five shelves of books—bedtime reading made easy.

TR's sister Corinne tells the story (Corinne Roosevelt Robinson, *My Brother Theodore Roosevelt,* p. 251) of an evening conversation in the White House when TR was getting ready to retire from President to big-game hunter and narrator of hunting tales. "Theodore," she said, "I want to give you a *real* present before you go away. What do you think you would like?" He replied, "Do you really want to make me a real present? I think I should like a pigskin library. I couldn't go anywhere, not even into jungles in Africa, without a good many books." So the Pigskin Library was assembled—books including Macaulay and Carlyle, the Bible and Euripides—bound in pig to wear well on the trail. TR looked to the condition of his double elephant rifle, but he took special pains with the books.

They were packed in an aluminum case, wrapped in oilskin, and a special porter was assigned to carry the sixty-pound load. If you stop at Theodore Roosevelt House, 28 East 20th Street, Manhattan, you may inspect the collection.

But why dawdle? Here is TR's thought on book collecting (*An Autobiography*, the first edition, Macmillan and Company, New York and London, 1913, pp. 359-361):

> The books are everywhere. There are as many in the north room and in the parlor . . . as in the library; the gunroom at the top of the house, which incidentally has the loveliest view of all, contains more books than any of the other rooms; and they are particularly delightful books to browse among, just because they have not much relevance to one another, this being one of the reasons why they are relegated to their present abode. But the books have overflowed into all the other rooms too.
>
> I could not name any principle upon which the books have been gathered Books are almost as individual as friends There is no earthly use in laying down general laws about them. Some meet the needs of one person, and some of another; and each person should beware of the booklover's besetting sin, of what Mr. Edgar Allen Poe calls "the mad pride of intellectuality," taking the shape of arrogant pity for the man who does not like the same kind of books. Of course there are books which a man or woman uses as instruments of profession—law books, medical books, cookery books, and the like. I am not speaking of these, for they are not properly "books" at all; they come in the category of time-tables, telephone directories, and the other useful agencies of civilized life. I am speaking of books that are meant to be read. Personally, granted that these books are decent and healthy, the one test to which I demand that they all submit is that of being interesting. If the book is not interesting to the reader, then in all but an infinitesimal number of cases it gives scant benefit to the reader. Of course any reader ought to cultivate his or her taste so that good books will appeal to it, and that trash won't. But after this point has once been reached, the needs of each reader must be met in a fashion that will appeal to those needs. Personally the books by which I have profited infinitely more than by any others have been those in which profit was a by-product of the pleasure; that is, I read them because I enjoyed them, because I liked reading them, and the profit came in as part of the enjoyment.
>
> Of course each individual is apt to have some special tastes in which he cannot expect that any but a few friends will share. Now, I am very proud of my big-game library. I suppose there must be many big-game libraries in Continental Europe, and possibly in England, more extensive than mine, but I have not happened to come across any such library in this country. Some of the originals go back to the sixteenth century, and there are copies or reproductions of the two or three most famous hunting books of the Middle Ages, such as the Duke of York's translation of Gaston Phoebus, and the queer book of the Emperor Maximilian. It is only very occasionally that I meet any one who cares for any of these books. On the other hand, I expect to find many friends who will turn naturally to some of the old or the new books of poetry or romance or history to which we of the household habitually turn. Let me add that ours is in no sense a collector's library. Each book was procured because some one of the family wished to read it. We could never afford to take overmuch thought for the outsides of books; we were too much interested in their insides. (Reprinted by permission of Charles Scribner's Sons.)

# THE UNIVERSITY OF DENVER
# SCHOOL OF SPEECH

## Examples of Advanced
## Programs of Study Now Underway

**For the Master of Arts Degree:** 52½ graduates quarter hours without thesis
45 graduate quarter hours with thesis

| Major Concentrations | Cognate Areas |
|---|---|
| Discussion and Public Address | Communication Methodology |
| Speech and Hearing Disorders | Psychology |
| Communication Methodology | Theatre Arts |
| Oral Interpretation | Radio and TV |

**For the Doctor of Philosophy Degree**

| Majors | Minors | Cognate Areas |
|---|---|---|
| Public Address and Discussion | Speech Pathology | Communication Methodology |
| Speech Pathology and Hearing | Communication Methodology | Psychology and Special Education |
| Theatre Arts | Oral Interpretation | Social Science |
| Communication Methodology | Mass Media | English Literature |
| Mass Media | Communication Methodology | English Literature |

### 1958 SUMMER SESSION

VISITING LECTURERS

**Russell Meyers, M.D.**, Chairman, Division of Neurosurgery, University of Iowa; President, Institute of General Semantics
**Beryl Payne, M.A.**, Associate Engineer, Mathematics Group, Pilotless Aircraft Division, Boeing Aircraft, Seattle, Washington
**Kenneth Pike, Ph.D.**, English Department, University of Michigan
**Thurston Womack, Ph.D.**, Specialist in Language Processes, San Francisco State College

SPECIAL FEATURES

**6th Workshop for Directors of Forensics—June 23-July 25**
**23rd Summer High School Institute—June 23-July 25**
**12th Summer Laboratory in Interpersonal Communication—June 16-August 15**
**11th Summer Workshop in Basic Communication—June 16-July 18**

SPRING QUARTER
March 24-June 6, 1958

SUMMER SESSION
June 16-August 15, 1958

AUTUMN QUARTER
September 18-December 5, 1958

WINTER QUARTER
January 5-March 20, 1959

*for further information write:*

Elwood Murray, Ph.D., Director
School of Speech, University of Denver
Denver 10, Colorado